



CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Scripture and Tradition in the Council of Trent
RICHARD BAEPLER

The Sixteenth-Century "Confessyon of the Fayth
of the Germaynes" in Twentieth-Century
American English
HERBERT J. A. BOUMAN

"But Right or Wrong—My Architecture"
GEORGE W. HOYER

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXI

June 1960

No. 6

T

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Volume XXXI

June 1960

Number 6

Published by

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH—MISSOURI SYNOD

Edited by

THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY

SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

T

Vol.

Edit

Scri

The

"Bu

Ho

TH

Bo

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed. \$3.50 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance. Second-class postage paid at St. Louis, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

XUM

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XXXI

JUNE 1960

No. 6

Editorial Comment	340
Scripture and Tradition in the Council of Trent. RICHARD BAEPLER	341
The Sixteenth-Century "Confessyon of the Fayth of the Germaynes" in Twentieth-Century American English. HERBERT J. A. BOUMAN	363
"But Right or Wrong — My Architecture." GEORGE W. HOYER	371
HOMILETICS	379
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	387
BOOK REVIEW	391

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER
RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, MARTIN H. FRANZMANN
ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER, ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN
WALTER R. ROEHR,^{*} LEWIS W. SPITZ

GILBERT A. THIELE

* On leave of absence

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
Victor Bartling, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

Editorial Comment

The fifties of our century produced an unusually large number of theological investigations of the term "tradition." Whether the wide interest in this term resulted from efforts in ecumenical circles to determine precisely what Protestantism means with its accent on the sole authority of Scripture, or whether this interest resulted from the proclamation in 1950 by Pius XII of the dogma of the Bodily Assumption of Mary, or whether other factors contributed to this veritable explosion of investigations of the term "tradition," may be difficult to establish. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in reviewing theological studies published in the past decade one discovers article after article, as well as a number of exceedingly important books, titled "Church, Scripture, and Tradition," or bearing similar headings.

Some of these investigations concentrate on the meaning of the term "tradition" as used in the early Christian centuries. Others examine the meaning and significance attached to the term by the Reformers and reflected in sixteenth-century Confessions. Roman Catholic and Anglican writers, in particular, have surveyed the meaning of the term as employed in "early Catholicism," in the patristic period, in the Middle Ages, and by champions of their faith since the sixteenth century.

Therefore the feature article in this issue of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, in which Richard Baeppler takes a close look at the proceedings which led the Council of Trent on April 8, 1546, to set up "tradition" as of equal authority to the Bible and thus to introduce what has been labeled "the new Trent religion," seems eminently relevant. The editors of

this journal believe many readers will join them in thanking Mr. Baeppler for his valuable contribution. The relevance of his article becomes evident also from the report that a special commission of the Lutheran World Federation under the leadership of Professor K. E. Skydsgaard will, in the next few years, study "the problem of Scripture and tradition, especially in view of recent developments in Mariology and other problems" (see under "Theological Observer" p. 388).

The Lutheran position with respect to Scripture and "tradition" is spelled out in her Symbols. It seems appropriate, therefore, at this point to call attention to Professor Herbert J. A. Bouman's review of English translations of the Lutheran Symbols, including his evaluation of the latest translation titled *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. We fully agree with Professor Bouman:

There is now no excuse for the Lutheran parishioner of average intelligence and education to neglect a study of the historic formulations of his faith, and certainly there is none for the Lutheran pastor not to incite his people to such study (p. 370). Applying Professor Bouman's observation to the case in point, we add that the interested student of the Lutheran Symbols, be he layman, pastor, or teacher, will become more and more persuaded that not "Scripture and Tradition," but "Holy Scripture remains the *only* judge, rule, and norm according to which as the only touchstone all doctrines should and must be understood and judged as good or evil, right or wrong" (FC, Part I: Epitome 7).

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

Scripture and Tradition in the Council of Trent

By RICHARD BAEPLER

THIS study deals with the historical circumstances surrounding the Roman Catholic doctrinal decision at the Council of Trent regarding the authority of Scripture and tradition. By examining this decision in the light of events which led to its formulation as well as in the light of its subsequent fate, we shall be introduced to an issue which has become very much alive in both Roman Catholic and Protestant thought.

In the past, Roman theology has tended to exalt tradition above Scripture; Protestants, in asserting their antithesis, have reversed the relationship. On the side of Roman Catholicism Biblical and patristic studies have prospered to such an extent that the Bible can no longer be relegated to a secondary role. In Protestantism the ecumenical movement has focused on the Bible as a common denominator in Christendom, but this has paradoxically emphasized the multitude of factors which shape the *interpretation* of the Bible. Within confessional Lutheranism the question also takes other forms, the most enduring being that of the relationship of the Lutheran Confessions to the Bible and of the Lutheran Confessions to non-Lutheran confessions.

The relationship of Scripture to tradition is, of course, an aspect of the larger problem of authority in the church. Thus the churchmen at Trent felt they were dealing with a foundational issue when, in the fourth session, they treated this subject explicitly.

HOW THE REFORMATION RAISED A QUESTION FOR WHICH THERE WAS NO SINGLE TRADITIONAL ANSWER

That the problem of authority could be raised at all and in the form that it was raised in the 16th century was due to a modification which the understanding of the church had undergone since the beginning of the Middle Ages. Without advancing detailed patristic evidence it is possible to say that in general the patristic period did not feel the necessity for carefully defining and setting off such elements as church, Scripture, tradition, and authority. The common understanding of the church implied that the church, Scripture, and tradition were part of a whole, participating in the common authority of Christ. Theology was essentially exegetical in character, and tradition would ordinarily point to the commonly accepted understanding of the Bible as expressed in creeds, liturgy, and other forms. In this spirit Vincent of Lerins defined the true teaching of the church as that which is taught everywhere, always, and by everyone. Vincent was probably directing this against the theological reforms of St. Augustine, but he expressed the idea of catholicity which the ancient church would probably have accepted as descriptive of the real situation.

By the time of the Middle Ages subtle new forces were at work. Theology was in theory exegetical theology, although for some time before the revival of learning

it had been reduced to patristic quotations. But with the 12th-century renaissance came a renewed interest in the study of the Bible and the fathers. The two were felt to be a whole, sometimes the term *sacra pagina* being extended to cover the fathers as well as the canonical books. Newly discovered linguistic tools stimulated students toward new and fresh exegesis.¹

The same revival produced a new interest in dialectics and consequently in philosophical theology. The study of the Bible was crowded out of the schools and found refuge in the monasteries, which continued to produce a stream of Biblicalistic thought.

At the same time the understanding of the church had undergone a subtle but important change. Rudolph Sohm has described this change as the change from an organism to an essentially juridical organization.² Political developments pitted the church against the state over questions involving jurisdiction and authority. From another viewpoint the same question of authority was being raised by reform movements. The church was forced to develop organs for deliberation and for unified action, the Bishop of Rome becoming the chief beneficiary of these developments. In philosophy the power of nominalism would accelerate the breakdown. In theology the Vincentian consensus would be analyzed for its component parts in terms of Scripture, tradition, conciliar decrees, papal decrees, customs new and old.

One towering figure in the 12th century

¹ B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1952), pp. 37—82.

² K. D. Schmidt, *Studien zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient* (Tübingen, 1925), p. 167, comments on the thought of Sohm with discernment.

incarnates the new trends: Peter Abelard, the father of scholasticism. His *Sic et Non* was a collection of mutually contradictory Biblical and patristic passages. He aimed to dispute the acceptance of doctrine on blind faith by introducing *ratio* and critical inquiry. The writings of the fathers are to be read "not with the necessity of believing but with the liberty of judging." He halts only when confronted by the canon. Here no error is possible.³

These developments imposed upon the church's theologians the task of clarifying the relationship between Scripture, tradition, authority, and the church. To the extent that these questions are raised and become issues in theology, to that extent we are witnessing a breakdown of the natural unity between Bible and church that had for long characterized Western church life. Symptomatic of this disintegration is the flurry of spiritualistic, prophetic, and Biblicalistic movements, of which the Waldensians are an important example.

The new situation is already evident in the theology of St. Thomas. For St. Thomas the authority of Scripture is axiomatic, is *proprie et ex necessitate* (*Summa*, I, Q.I, Art. VIII). The authority of the fathers is not quite on the same level. It is rather *probabiliter*. No genuine contradiction between the church and the Bible is contemplated by Thomas, for he still presupposes a natural unity. But should there be some differences among theologians in individual Biblical interpretation the matter would, in the last analysis, be settled by papal decision. He uses tradition chiefly as a verb to refer to the transmission of

³ R. Seeberg, *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*, translated from the German by C. E. Hay (Grand Rapids, 1952), II, 58.

Scripture. Casually and naturally he draws upon noncanonical apostolic tradition in discussing sacraments and the reverencing of images. His method is exegetical so far as he is concerned.⁴

Alexander of Hales equates theology with Sacred Scriptures, scarcely even mentioning the word *tradition*. When it is used, it refers to the Word of God, which has been handed down in the Bible.⁵

St. Bonaventure, in his commentary on the sentences, does not even treat tradition or the teaching office of the church. Later in the commentary he occasionally refers to apostolic traditions in connection with the reverencing of images of Christ. Yet he is quite clear that *autoritas principaliter* resides in the Bible. (Brev. V 7)

One of the first theologians to deal with a possible contradiction between Scripture and the church, Henry of Ghent, put the question in a purely hypothetical sense: "Must we believe rather the authorities of doctrine (Bible) than those of the church, or the other way around?" His answer was the classical answer that there is no contradiction between the church and the Bible. Should, however, the visible form of the church contradict the Bible in any way, the Word of Scripture would be the only true authority, for its teaching is immutable, while the teaching of human beings is changeable.⁶

Both St. Thomas and Henry of Ghent are aware of the possible element of error

in the human attempt to interpret the Scriptures. To counter this danger a typical proponent of the papalist position, Guido Terreni, introduces the work of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit, he argues, is at work in the church, and particularly does He assist the Supreme Pontiff in his decisions, also with respect to the correct interpretation of the Scriptures. For the authority of the canon itself is dependent upon the church, particularly the pope.⁷

Both Henry's and Guido's views are distortions of the patristic and earlier medieval view which considered Scriptures and church to be "mutually inherent" (Tavard). A more subtle but equally revealing expression is that of Nicholas of Lyra: "I protest that I wish to state or determine nothing but what has been plainly determined either by Sacred Scriptures or by the Church's authority." The either-or implies a double authority which would permit emphasizing one at the expense of the other or at least would obscure any unity of authority.⁸

During the 14th century, theologians vigorously discussed the question of authority. Marsilius of Padua declared that Scripture alone (*solum . . . Scripturam*) is true and must be believed for salvation; other writings of men may contain truth, but they are less reliable. Should there be doubt over unclear passages, a general church council would decide.⁹

The term *sola Scriptura* is repeatedly used by William Occam in formulating his position. He denies the church the right to establish doctrines apart from Scripture.

⁴ Relevant passages collected by A. Denefee, *Der Traditionsbegriff* (Münster, 1931), pp. 76 and 77.

⁵ Ibid., p. 75.

⁶ G. Tavard, "Holy Church or Holy Writ: a Dilemma of the Fourteenth Century," *Church History*, XXIII (September 1954), p. 196 ff. This excellent article deserves thoughtful study.

⁷ Ibid., p. 199.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ F. Kropatscheck, *Das Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 292 ff.

Only the Scriptures are without error; the pope and the councils can err. The only infallible interpreter of Scriptures is the whole church.¹⁰

For John Wycliffe the authority of Scripture derives from Christ. It is His book, and thus, he argues, one is compelled to acknowledge the *sola Scriptura* position. Still sensing a relationship between church and Scripture, he states a preference for the ancient church, which was relatively pure and had no pope. The institution of the papacy should be eliminated because it is not Scriptural.¹¹

Wycliffe's opponent, the learned Thomas Netter, argued chiefly on the basis of Scripture and the early fathers. He pointed to the history of heresies as proof of the need for authoritative interpretation of the Bible while admitting at the same time the supreme authority of Scriptures. The church which had established the canon should be the authoritative interpreter. Netter also spoke of an oral tradition which derived from the apostles, enabling the church to interpret authoritatively.¹²

The 15th-century nominalist Gabriel Biel argued that the Scriptures could not err, whereas the pope can. Still, reform in the church required more than Scripture, which was primarily a book for faith. There were also to be believed truths not found in Scripture. But he denied that the pope or church could create new dogma¹³

The 15th-century conciliarists shared a common view of the high authority of Scriptures. No dogma, institution, law, or

reason could make a claim for authority in the church unless it was based on Scriptures. The fathers, in some sense inspired, were excellent guides in the interpretation of Scripture. Particularly important is their method of throwing light on dubious passages by comparing them with clear texts. Yet their chief interest was not in the authority of the Bible but in a definition of the decisive organ of the church.¹⁴

It is very difficult to describe the complex 16th-century situation. There was no unified Protestant or Roman position, but both sides had theologians with a wide variety of views. Moving freely on either side were the humanists, many of whom shared with the Protestants an antagonism toward the corruption within the church, an antipathy toward decadent scholasticism, and an urge to return to the sources of the faith.

Luther's own position is not simple, for it developed over a period of years. Primarily concerned for the centrality of the preached Gospel, his views of Scripture and tradition would follow from his evangelical and kerygmatic center. In his *Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute* (1518) he bids the pope speak of Christ as Judge over the indulgence dispute. The pope is to be obeyed when he agrees with canonical law or a council, not when he speaks his own opinions.¹⁵ It was Eck who then formulated the debate in terms of authority, attempting to identify Luther with the conciliarists. Luther does seem to hold substantially to a conciliarist position, though he is forced by Eck to state that both pope and council are human and

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 309 ff.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 326 ff.

¹² Deneffe, p. 78.

¹³ Kropatscheck, pp. 322 ff.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 382 ff.

¹⁵ WA 1, 527, 574, 582.

therefore can err.¹⁶ We are reminded of earlier statements (Thomas and others) which attributed probability to human deductions from Scripture, since only God is infallible and unchangeable.

How, then, did Luther regard the church's tradition? The ancient creeds he accepted and expounded because they summed up Scriptural teaching.¹⁷ Against sectarians he would summon the practice and teaching of the ancient church. On the other hand, the opinion of Paul was superior to the opinion of all the fathers whether they be Athanasius, Ambrose, or Augustine himself.¹⁸ The most thoughtful statement of views appears in 1539 in his treatise *Von Konzilien und Kirchen*. In the same year Melanchthon published a similar essay: *De ecclesia et autoritate Verbi Dei*. Both Luther and Melanchthon are in substantial agreement that the ancient church is purer than the present Roman Church, but that the fathers must be studied critically, the Word of God always remaining the norm. An interesting divergence is, however, discernible. Luther is always favoring the conciliarist position, sees congregations, schools, and pastors as little councils who are safe guides for people in their study of the Word; Melanchthon, partly because he was writing against Servetus, tends to draw upon the historical past of the church to substantiate his argument.¹⁹ In the Augsburg Confes-

sion and Apology the use of patristic evidence in a corroborative fashion is evident. The Augsburg Confession declares its theology to be that of the Roman Church as known by her writings (AC XXI). Melanchthon does seem to restrict "traditions" to rites and ceremonies, blasting the position which requires the observance of traditions which contradict the Gospel (AC XXVI). Yet traditions which do not contradict the Gospel are retained (AC XV). Melanchthon's pupil Chemnitz, in a more detached way than either Luther or Melanchthon, will be able to formulate a Lutheran statement on tradition which gives great weight to patristic evidence. Jan Koopmans sums up the difference between Luther and Melanchthon admirably: Luther placed all emphasis on the Word of God, and to understand this Word, he had no need of fathers or councils. What he needed was the brother who would witness to him the forgiveness of sins, under the authority of the Word, and such brothers were the church fathers. Melanchthon saw the church in less eschatological terms, was sensitive to Scriptural manipulation, and sought the Augustinian unity of Scriptures and church. But too much a child of his times, he could not create that unity in such a way that church and Bible remained side by side. We should also note the dynamic view of both Scripture and tradition which would seem to be implied in Luther's emphasis on the living, spoken, and preached Word.²⁰

Calvin, too, understood theology to stand in obedience to the Word. His most extensive statement of position on our issue is his *Defensio contra Pighium*.²¹ He

¹⁶ J. Koopmans, *Das altkirchliche Dogma in der Reformation* (Munich, 1955), pp. 17, 18.

¹⁷ W. Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums* (Munich, 1931), I, 180 ff.

¹⁸ Koopmans, p. 39. Also see Polman, *L'Elément Historique dans la Controverse Religieuse du XVIème Siècle* (Gembloix, 1932), pp. 27—31.

¹⁹ Koopmans, p. 29.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 31, 32.

²¹ CR VI, pp. 320 ff.

agrees with Pighius that the church cannot err, but only under the condition that she is obedient to the Word. A student of Augustine, Calvin also strives toward unity of Bible and church. He does not reject traditions outright, as many left-wing Reformers did, but critically distinguishes between true and false traditions. He reads the fathers as chiefly supporting the Reformation position, which leads him to conclude that the Reformers and the ancient church stand opposed to the papacy in common service to Christ.²² This position was shared by many Reformers, especially those with humanistic tendencies, and led to a great flourishing of patristic studies, of which the school of Bullinger in Strasbourg is perhaps the most eminent example.²³

There was also a left-wing reformation with radical theological views. Men such as Carlstadt and Bucer had little use for tradition of any sort. They even tended to reject all non-Biblical theological terminology. No doubt their extreme views tended to obscure the conservative standpoint of many of the Reformers, especially during the early years of the Reformation. But the course of debate between Protestant and Roman theologians gradually moved from the argument over Biblical and ecclesiastical authority to controversy over Biblical and patristic issues. This would seem to indicate that the conservative Protestant argument was felt by the Roman theologians to be the most serious position. But left-wing radicals are pointed to as people who are consistent in their *sola Scriptura* views, as the sole logical position of people who disregard ecclesiastical authority.

²² Koopmans, p. 41.

²³ Polman, pp. 98, 99.

The initial Roman argument against the Reformers followed the lead set by Eck. There is a general unanimity in the first stage of the polemics, most of the controversialists pounding away at the formal insufficiency of Scripture. They argue that Scripture is obscure, that it is peculiarly subject to extravagant manipulation, that its free interpretation is the source of all heresies. Such insufficiency required the authority of the church. It was the same church which established the canon which guarantees authentic interpretation.

This initial argument was not particularly effective, since many of the Reformers could agree in a formal way with these assertions, provided of course the "church" were understood in the Reformation sense. Indeed, precisely this issue concerning the nature of the church, which had lain dormant since the beginning of the Middle Ages, embarrassed the Roman dogmatists, since it was all too apparent that unanimity was lacking among them. The church was a complex reality. Which were the component parts?

Some, such as John Fisher, attempted to maintain a unified picture of the church in which the church is considered a living whole, consisting of all the faithful among whom the Holy Spirit is active preserving the true doctrine. In this whole Fisher distinguished several elements: fathers, councils, apostolic traditions, customs of the church. On the other hand, the Italian Dominican Prierias opposes to Luther the authority of the pope, the councils, and the church. In Eck's view the pope and councils represent the church.²⁴

Much less agreement is present over the

²⁴ The arguments are well summarized by Polman, pp. 284—293.

issue of who or what is the organ of the church. Bartholomew Latomus speaks of the faith in the hearts of all the people. John Fisher held that the church speaks through the mouth of the fathers. Driedo and Peresius promote the Church of Rome, while Pighius holds to the person of the pope as the proper ecclesiastical organ.²⁵

In what sense do the fathers speak for the church? The distinction is usually made between the fathers as individuals and the fathers as a group. While individually they may err, collectively they have authority. But whence do they receive this authority? Some held that their authority came from the Holy Spirit; others that their authority derived from the approval of the church. In the case of councils similar uncertainty showed itself. Was the council independently infallible or only when approved by the pope?²⁶

There was no unanimity on this issue, and thus the Roman attack on the formal sufficiency of Scripture lost force. This same weakness will show itself in the Council of Trent; it did not achieve a clarification of the nature of the church.

The controversy entered a new stage with the Reformation's critical attack on doctrines not in the Bible and with the Roman assertion of the material insufficiency of the Bible. The concept of tradition was deeply involved, and at this stage it suffers a considerable reduction at the hands of many polemicists, coming to refer to those doctrines not written in Scripture.²⁷ In the patristic and early scholastic period, tradition had included the transmission of the whole apostolic preach-

ing, chiefly in Scriptures. But already in the writings of Bonaventure and St. Thomas the notion of a non-Scriptural source of truth is mentioned in connection with the reverencing of images and sacraments. More evidence of such a source can be found in Occam, it has recently been asserted, and in Thomas Netter the idea is full-blown.²⁸ Again this development witnesses to the breakdown to which we have previously referred. Now, in the 16th century, the pressures of polemic have constricted the idea of tradition to those doctrines outside the Scripture. And yet even here great diversity is to be found. Some Roman theologians emphasize the apostolic character of tradition and give highest authority only to tradition which can be established as apostolic. Other theologians stress ecclesiastical traditions, not distinguishing between apostolic and ecclesiastical, holding that the authority of the church is decisive. We may examine the relevant teaching of some of the leading pre-Tridentine Roman theologians.

We possess a thorough study of the dogmatist Johann Driedo's idea of tradition.²⁹ Christ and the apostles bring the revelation of God. But not everything they revealed was committed to writing. That which was written is the Bible; the rest of

²⁵ The relevant material is collected by J. Beumer, "Das Katholische Schriftprinzip in der theologischen Literatur der Scholastik bis zur Reformation," *Scholastik*, XVI (1941), 24—52. The revised views on Occam are reported by A. van Lecumen, "L'Eglise, règle de foi, dans les écrits de Guillaume d'Occam," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, XI (Jan—Jun 1934), 249 ff.

²⁶ J. Lodrio, "La Notion de Tradition dans la Théologie de Jean Driedo de Louvain," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, XXVI (Jan—Jun 1950), 37—53.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 294.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 294—303.

²⁷ Denefle, pp. 127—130.

the revelation comes to us through the church. This is the tradition. It is apostolic in that its source is Christ or the apostles. The church may draw out the implications of this tradition, may clarify and develop it, but cannot add to it. Tradition is used by Driedo in a twofold sense: as the original deposit of faith and as the active handing down of the apostolic truth through the physical succession of bishops. The distinction between apostolic tradition and ecclesiastical customs is made also by John Fisher, but although he does not explicitly equate their authority, he uses them for all practical purposes as if they were on the same level.³⁰

We have a full study by George Tavard of the monk Nikolaus Ellenbog on this issue. Ellenbog did not occupy an influential chair at a university but was active in 16th-century polemics. He is valuable in particular because of his extensive correspondence with Romans and Protestants. We have seen previously that the aid of the Holy Spirit has been invoked by thinkers to account for certainty in matters which were not clear in the canon. Ellenbog logically carries this line of thought to the conclusion that if the Spirit once gave revelation to the apostles, and if Christ promised the Spirit to the church, the Spirit continues to reveal through the church. Thus there is revealed the authoritative interpretation of Scripture. This post-canonical inspiration also accounts for later ecclesiastical customs, particularly those which proceed from councils and the pope. Here there is no distinction made between apostolic and post-apostolic inspiration. The church can add new doc-

trines to the original deposit, even some which contradict earlier assertions.³¹

Albertus Pighius in his earlier writings uses the terms apostolic traditions and ecclesiastical traditions in about the same way, later choosing to use the latter designation only, referring to those extracanonical truths with apostolic origins.³²

Peresius Aiala, who participated in the Council of Trent, distinguishes traditions from Christ, traditions from the apostles, and traditions from bishops. The first two uses are the most important for him, so that tradition comes to designate that doctrine which is extracanonical. The authority of Scripture is guaranteed by the authority of the church manifesting itself in tradition. Three criteria for finding that tradition are (1) the belief of the universal church, principally Rome; (2) the general councils; (3) the orthodox fathers.³³

One of the members of the committee which helped produce the fourth session's decree was Alfonso de Castro. In his *Adversus haereses* he asserted that many things taught by Christ were not written down by the apostles but have come down to us by mouth to mouth and heart to heart. He emphasized that behind this tradition is the authority of the church, which is as strong today as when it first established the canon.³⁴

Confronted by a wide variety of theological positions within Christendom, how would the Council respond to the ques-

³⁰ J. Fisher, *Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio* (Coloniae, 1553), p. 22.

³¹ Tavard, "A Forgotten Theology of Inspiration: Nikolaus Ellenbog's refutation of 'Scriptura Sola,'" *Franciscan Studies*, XV (June 1955), pp. 106—122.

³² Polman, p. 305.

³³ Deneffe, pp. 84, 85.

³⁴ A. de Castro, *Adversus haereses*, Lib. I Cap. V (Basel, 1534).

tion? The fact that the Reformers were not represented, and that the membership was deliberately weighted with prelates rather than with theologians seemed to prejudice the true catholicity of the answer.

II

HOW THE COUNCIL PRODUCED A COMPROMISE FORMULA WHICH SETTLED NOTHING

The debates leading up to the fourth session fall naturally into two parts, the first beginning Feb. 8, 1546, and ending with the first draft of the decree March 22, 1546, the second leading to the adoption of the final text on April 8, 1546.³⁵ The two texts are given at the end of this article, and the debate may be best understood through constant reference to them.

In reviewing the main lines of the debate we may note four salient features. The first is the confusion that reigns concerning the term *tradition*. Shall tradition be designated "apostolic" or "ecclesiastical," or does it make any difference? No final clarity is achieved, although the final decree (which uses neither) in substance means apostolic tradition. But to the very end of the discussion no genuine clarity is achieved.

The second feature we note is the unwillingness of the council to grapple with the definition of authority or of the church. The issue is raised on several occasions, but it is always postponed, never to be undertaken formally in the final promulgation.

³⁵ The sources for the council are collected in *Concilium Tridentinum*, edited by the Societas Goerresiana (Freiburg, 1901). We shall henceforth refer to this simply by a Roman numeral (for the volume) and an Arabic number (for the page).

Thirdly, we should follow the fate of the *partim . . . partim* clause introduced by Cardinal del Monte and included in the first draft of the decree but dropped later. We shall analyze this more closely at the appropriate point.

Fourthly, we should note the excited debate over the phrase *pri pietatis affectu*, first applied to all the canonical books, later extended to include the tradition. This controversy became another form of the argument between apostolic and ecclesiastical partisans.

The letters of the papal legates to Farnese reveal their plan to propose that the council accept Sacred Scriptures as the source of doctrine; to establish that all of Jesus' revelation was not recorded in the Bible but that some was handed down in the tradition; that after the Ascension, the Holy Spirit continues His work of revealing in the church, the results of which are found in the tradition which is defined chiefly by the councils. (X 373)

On Feb. 8 the legates inform the council that they first ought to receive Scriptures as the source of theology (I 28). On Feb. 11 they add that "tradition" ought to be considered also. In the discussion Seripando, general of the Augustinians, and the Bishop of Fano suggested a distinction among Biblical books according to their religious value, but there was no support for this move (V 7 ff.). In their subsequent letter the papal legates indicate satisfaction with the proceedings. In this letter it becomes clear that their intention is to formulate a general statement which will defend the church's practice against Protestant claims that such practice is not in the Bible. (X 378, 386).

After preliminary discussion concerning

the method of receiving the Sacred Scriptures, Cardinal del Monte introduced the question of tradition immediately at the general assembly on Feb. 12. His words are significant:

Noverunt Paternitates Vestrae, qualiter omnis fides nostra de revelatione divina est et hanc nobis traditam ab ecclesia partim ex scripturis, quae sunt in veteri et novo testamento, partim etiam ex simplici traditione per manus.

Therefore, he concluded, we should begin with Scripture and then deal with tradition. (V 7).

It is important to note that the traditions are here described as ecclesiastical traditions and that the *partim . . . partim* phrase would seem to imply a double transmission of revelation. This seems to be the only time in the debate in which "tradition" is used in a comprehensive sense to include both canonical and noncanonical doctrines.

Late at night in the meeting of Feb. 15 the issue *de receptione traditionum apostolicarum* is introduced, but the hour is too late for further consideration.

The next meeting was held on Feb. 18. In connection with the reception of Sacred Scriptures into the decrees, two related articles would need consideration: *de receptione traditionum apostolicarum* and the abuses in connection with the Sacred Scriptures (V 10). First it was necessary to decide in which order these two matters would be considered. The debate reveals the controversial nature of this issue. Some think that the abuses ought to be treated first, others argue for the traditions. Castellimaris would have the Scriptural abuses treated, followed by the traditions and the abuses pertaining to them.

The bishop of Fano argued that when we receive the Scriptures we necessarily receive the traditions, for both are dictated by the same Holy Spirit. (V 10)

Bellicastrensis took a strong position for the *traditiones ecclesiae et eius consuetudines, cum haec omnia principia sint nostrarum conclusionum* (V 10). Asturicensis thought the matter should be delegated and that weightier issues should be undertaken.

But the legate of Cardinal Giennensi, the Spanish theologian Alfonso de Castro, pushed the debate to the issue of authority, declaring that there was no unanimity among the delegates about that vital issue.

The diaries indicate an interesting sidelight, the Bishop of Cavo insisting that he believed the Gospel of John because John said so, not because the church said so. He received the reply that this was heretical. (I 484, 480)

The General of the Servites introduced a consideration of the councils and the papal decretals into the debate, since the heretics rejected their authority.

In summing up, the presiding cardinal, S. Crucis, thought that the majority desired a consideration of the traditions after the Sacred Scriptures, for there is no difference except that one is written and the other not, both having come from the same Holy Spirit. There are three *principia et fundamenta* of our faith: the first is the Sacred Scriptures, written by the Spirit's dictating; the second is the Gospel, which Christ taught orally, part of which some evangelists committed to writing, the rest being transmitted orally; and third is the ongoing revelation of the Holy Spirit in the church, which will continue until the consummation of the age. (V 11)

The meeting of Feb. 23 raised the question as to whether Scripture and tradition should be treated in the same decree or in separate decrees. The procurator of the cardinal of Augsburg suggested that they must distinguish a diversity of authorities and that there was a reception appropriate to each authority. Matters which pertain to faith must be received as the Gospel itself; other matters, such as rules concerning bigamy and the eating of strangled meat, are not so received.

This distinction was well taken, but De Castro, promoting a strong ecclesiastical position, proposed that the following be included in the decree:

Ultra autem sacros libros nonnulla in ecclesia Dei habemus quae scripta non sunt, sed ipsius ecclesiae auctoritate observantur, cui ecclesiae ab apostolis tradita sunt et per manus ad nos usque deveniunt. (V 7)

In summing up this meeting Cardinal S. Crucis accepted the distinction made between traditions which were essential to the faith and those pertaining to ceremonies. He then submitted a long series of Biblical and patristic quotations on the place of tradition in the church.

In reporting to the general assembly of Feb. 26 Cardinal S. Crucis achieved further precision in establishing a valid criterion for apostolic traditions. Remembering the distinction between essential and nonessential apostolic traditions, he designated those as essential *quae ab ecclesia receptae ad nos usque pervenerunt* (V 18). This criterion, therefore, is *continuity*.³⁶

³⁶ E. Ortigues, "Écritures et Traditions Apostoliques au Concile de Trente," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XXXVI (Avril, Mai, Juin 1949), p. 277.

This did not satisfy all. Turritano and others expressed the view that all the ecclesiastical traditions themselves should be *generaliter* accepted, that so much mention should not be made of *traditionum apostolicarum* lest the rest of the traditions would seem to be rejected (V 18). At this point Nacchianti, bishop of Chioggia, stood up and declared traditions to be substantially irrelevant because of the soteriological sufficiency of the Bible!

Nemo enim ignorat contineri in sacris libris omnia ea quae ad salutem pertinent.

After the presentation of the first draft on March 22, the council proceeded on March 23 to debate its adequacy. The records indicate that the draft of the decree, though ostensibly worked out by Cervini in committees, was in fact largely suggested by the papal legates already in February.³⁷

Senogallensis (V 33) thought the description of "tradition" was too general, since it would include traditions which were no longer in use or which had been rejected, e.g., the prohibition against strangled meat.

Feltrensis replied (V 33) that they followed the 7th council in speaking of traditions in general. As for those traditions no longer in use, the following sentence excludes them: *traditiones quae continua successive usque ad nos pervenerunt*. However, Senogallensis was not satisfied with this. (I 522)

There was considerable concern over the phrase *pari pietatis affectu*. The bishop of Fano and Bellicastrensis exchanged words on this issue. The bishop of Fano declared (I 523), "Non placet quod dicitur: pari

³⁷ K. D. Schmidt, p. 195.

pietatis affectu recipiendas esse traditiones, quia maiores auctoritates sunt scripturae quam traditiones." Yet lest the adversaries say that in accepting the apostolic traditions we reject the ecclesiastical traditions, it should be made clear that the latter are also given by the Holy Spirit.

Bellicastrensis thought that since the Spirit was the Author of both, and could change the traditions when it pleased Him, there should be no objection to the *pari pietatis affectu*.

A series of questions was then placed before the council. Some are irrelevant to our discussion.

Question 6: Should the traditions be named individually, or shall it be indicated simply that they exist and are received?

Question 7: Can we say of Scripture and traditions *par debetur pietatis affectus*, or shall an expression indicating *debita reverentia* be used?

Question 8: Should *pari pietatis affectu* be retained with a qualification that this pertains to dogmatic, not ceremonial matters?

Question 14: Should ecclesiastical traditions also be dealt with here?

On March 27 the bishop of Fano took up once again the theme that Scripture and tradition should not be received *pari pietatis affectu* because *inter haec maximum discrimin sit*. Scripture is unchangeable, while tradition can be modified by the church. The same Spirit may be behind them, but they are not on the same level. To combat Lutheran arguments, though, it would be enough to insert the following words:

quoniam sancta haec synodus scit, quam plura alia esse in ecclesia a Spiritu Sancto dictata, quae in sacris litteris non sunt

prodita, propterea illa quoque suspicit et veneratur.

Unless this distinction is made, he argued, the opposition would accuse us of receiving traditions against which we are violators. (V 40)

Bituntius (V 40), taking up the argument that the Holy Spirit was Author of both tradition and Scripture, suggested that the Spirit also authored other truths. So it would be insufficient merely to say that some traditions were abolished. Not everything established by the apostles has persisted. But there are some things, namely, those *quae ad fidem pertinent*, which are perpetually valid.

The changes did not satisfy all the men. Bishop Nacchianti of Chioggia raised a storm by declaring the *pari pietatis affectu* to be impious. Since this was taken by some to be personal and out of place, Nacchianti was forced to apologize (V 71). But his statement as such was not called heretical. The opposition to this formula exerted sufficient pressure to cause the committees to substitute *simili* for *pari* on April 6. The next day, by vast majority, this was changed back to *pari*.

On April 1 the fathers voted: 7 voted merely to note the existence of the tradition; 44 wanted to receive them; 33 accepted the *pari pietatis affectu*, while 11 proposed *simili pietatis affectu*; 3 voted *reverentia debetur*; 3 voted *dubie*, while there were 2 *nihil placet*; several abstained. 13 against 11 (with 28 abstaining) voted for making no distinction among traditions. The council was unanimous in postponing further discussion on ecclesiastical traditions. (V 42—58)

On April 5 the modified form of the decree was again presented. The chief

change was the insertion of *tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes*, to exclude ceremonial traditions and to establish an internal criterion.

Another significant change in the first draft was the elimination of the *partim . . . partim* formula. Shortly after the draft had been presented, Bonucci, the learned general of the Servites, criticized it by saying: *Iudico omnem veritatem evangelicam scriptam esse, non ergo partim.* Later he again protested against the suggestion that *veritatem evangelicam partim in scriptis, partim in traditionibus contineri.* (V 47)

The supporters of *partim . . . partim* tried to base their contention on John 21:25, which asserts that Jesus did many things which were not recorded. Campaglio refuted this (I, 525) by asserting that the Biblical basis for the council's action was John 16:13: "The Spirit will lead you into all truth."

The combined assault of Nacchianti, Bonucci and others forced the council to substitute . . . et . . . for *partim . . . partim*.

Father Geiselmann argues that the combined protest of Nacchianti and Bonucci, who both asserted the sufficiency of Scripture, succeeded in producing a compromise formula. This formula was deliberately left in an indecisive state, surely in part due to the reluctance of the papal legates to force the issue of supreme authority. What was decided was to reject the *partim . . . partim* formula, to lay great stress on the apostolic character of tradition, and to assert, however indistinctly, some basic unity between Scripture and tradition.³⁸

Geiselmann argues that the standpoint of Nacchianti and Bonucci, though a minority position at Trent, really has the authentic catholic tradition behind it as classically stated by Vincent of Lerins. Vincent not only stated the famous definition of catholicity in his *Commonitorium* but also asserted the sufficiency of Scripture. This document was rarely studied during the Middle Ages. Geiselmann thinks that an edition published in 1528 inspired these men to hold their position.³⁹ He seems to be supported in his general conclusions by Johann Beumer who has studied the catholic *Schriftprinzip*, particularly in the Middle Ages.⁴⁰ Surely there was much common ground on which the minority party at Trent and the conservative Reformers could stand.

III

HOW THE UNSETTLED QUESTION HAS ONCE AGAIN, AFTER MANY YEARS, REASSERTED ITSELF

The Protestant answer to the Council of Trent varied. The left wing continued to develop radically; its history would tend to support the claim that private interpretation, cut off from a creative relationship to the church's tradition, is self-destructive. The Reformed wing, sometimes tending toward a radical use of the Bible, outdid other branches of Protestantism in patristic studies which aimed to show the agreement of the Reformed position with the ancient church. But the most thorough treatment of the problem of tradition, both on the theoretical level and in actual theological application, came from Martin

³⁸ "Das Missverständnis über das Verhältnis von Schrift und Tradition und seine Überwindung in der katholischen Theologie," *Schrift und Tradition*, ed. T. Ellwein (Bad Boll, 1956), pp. 8, 9.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 8.

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 41, 50.

Chemnitz in his *Examen*.⁴¹ The burden of his argument is that Trent, not the Reformation, has been unfaithful to tradition in its total exposition of doctrine. Chemnitz, the *Martinus secundus* of the Reformation and a major author of the Formula of Concord, clearly distinguished his position from the Biblicalistic wing of Protestantism. He rejects Biblical interpretation which depends on one's own wisdom, for Scripture is not of private interpretation. We value highly and reverently use the labors of the fathers. Nor do we approve of someone who invents a sense of Scripture which contradicts all of antiquity.⁴²

Arguing that Trent was exploiting the imprecision so clearly evident in the use of the word "tradition," Chemnitz proceeded to distinguish eight kinds of tradition.⁴³

1. We may designate as tradition that which Christ and the apostles handed down *viva voce*, which the evangelists and apostles subsequently reduced to writing.

2. The faithful and careful transmission of the Sacred Scriptures in a certain connected succession to us is a form of tradition.

3. The rule of faith, a summary of Scriptural truth similar to the Apostles' Creed, such as that handed down by Irenaeus and Tertullian, may be called tradition.

4. The true exposition and understanding of Scripture was received by the primitive church from the apostles and handed

down. This, too, we accept as a valid form of tradition.

5. Dogmas not explicitly stated in Scripture but drawn from clear Scripture on the basis of sound reason are traditions. These have been transmitted by the church from the apostles. An example would be infant Baptism.

6. The catholic consensus of the fathers is a form of tradition in which we delight. Thus, as members of the catholic church, after we have set forth Scripture as judge in matters of religion, we immediately join to it the evidence of the catholic consensus.

7. Many ancient rites are designated as apostolic, though it cannot always be established that they derive from the apostles. Nevertheless, in our Christian freedom, we accept them; indeed, we retain and love them, for we distinguish between doctrine and rites. While all doctrines are taught in Scripture, many rites manifestly were not committed to writing, and so we receive them (e.g., renunciation of the devil, abrogation of the Sabbath, other rites in connection with Baptism which have edifying value, etc.).

8. The single sense of tradition to which Chemnitz objects is those matters of faith and morals which derive from post-apostolic times, or which are not written, i.e., without foundation in the canon, which are raised to the same level as the Scripturites.

It must be said, in evaluating Chemnitz's work, that we are confronted by a masterful handling of the problem which certainly tries to maintain a kind of unity between Scripture and tradition reminiscent of the classical position. It is an advance (which was not developed by his successors) that

⁴¹ Martin Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, ed. Ed. Preuss (Berlin, 1861). Also see J. Pelikan, "Tradition in Confessional Lutheranism," *Lutheran World* III (December 1956), 219 ff.

⁴² Ibid., Part I, sec. 8, p. 66.

⁴³ Chemnitz, pp. 70—99.

Chemnitz recognizes Scripture to be a part of tradition ("tradition" in the senses in which he defined it). There are many passages which seem to be striving for that unity.

Chemnitz is a major author of the Formula of Concord which, though it speaks of the Scriptures as the pure fountain of Israel, qualifies this by adding immediately that the function of Scripture is to judge doctrine. This would suggest that doctrine is an entity in some sense derived from Scripture, yet apart from Scripture, which is brought into some kind of relationship to Scripture without being identified with it. The comparison further suggests that this doctrine, controlled by the norm within tradition, becomes the norm for the living preaching and teaching of the church.

In the 17th century, Protestants, such as Grotius and Calixtus, still attempted to utilize tradition in a constructive and creative way by insisting that tradition in some sense precedes Scripture, but the power of rationalism triumphed in theology, reducing much of Protestant thought to a one-sided emphasis either on the Bible or on individual experience.

On the Roman side the decision of Trent did not prevent theologians from speaking about tradition in the same way as before. Some precision, however, is achieved through the great and decisive work of Melchior Cano.⁴⁴ *De locis theologicis* was published shortly before the council was closed. This work is a basic treatise on theological methodology, was a product of the theological renaissance which was to put Spain in the front ranks of theology

for some time, and became determinative for nearly every dogmatician who followed him, including the great Bellarmine. Without exaggerating we can say that post-Tridentine theology, at least on the question of Scripture and tradition, is based on Cano rather than the council.⁴⁵

In his book he sets forth 10 kinds of theological authority, presumably in their order of importance. First is Sacred Scripture, second are apostolic traditions, third is the catholic church, fourth are the councils, fifth is the Roman Church, etc. Here at last clarity is achieved in clearly distinguishing apostolic authority from ecclesiastical authority and in indicating criteria for establishing that authority. However, the *partim . . . partim* formula is still retained (1. III, c. 3), and the analysis of various kinds of authority obscures the question of their unity.

Thus the same rationalism which desiccated Protestantism will now reduce Roman theology in the main to a kind of scholasticism in which authority and certitude become the chief issues, the latter growing in importance for two reasons. Historical criticism called into question certainty which was based on history, since historical analysis could only yield probabilities. In addition, the Thomistic revival reaffirmed that deductions drawn from revelation by reason had only probability, not certainty, for reason was fallible. Thus in July 1601, Father Gaspar Hurtado of the University of Alcalá, defended as a thesis for his doctorate a number of propositions, among them that "it is not *de fide* that

⁴⁴ M. Cano, *De locis theologicis*, in *Melchioris Cani opera* (Petavius, 1734).

⁴⁵ This opinion is supported by A. Michel in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, ed. E. Amann and others (Paris, 1903), Vol. XV, col. 1322.

a particular person, e.g., Clement VIII, is Pope." The reasoning was that while revelation may declare the successor of Peter to be pope, only historical and rational investigation could affirm that Clement VIII was the successor of St. Peter.⁴⁶

The developing sense of history weakened the classical Roman polemic against the Protestants, formulated by Bossuet, that while Catholicism remained unchanged all through history, heresy represented variation. Prophetic of the decay of this argument is the work of Petavius (d. 1652), who, a patristic scholar and not a schoolman, formulated the theory that Platonism was at the root of all heresy. "In five successive chapters Petavius surveyed ante-Nicene Christianity, showed how heresarchs like Marcion and Tatian depended upon Platonic presuppositions, displayed the cloven hoof peeping out beneath the togas of Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria and Origen."⁴⁷ He was joined by the famous 17th-century French Benedictines, among whom the study of patristics reached new heights. So at the time when Richard Simon, for the Protestants, was startling Biblical scholars with new critical studies, these French historians were beginning to throw doubt on well-intrenched legends in the vulgar Roman tradition.

The man chiefly responsible for giving Rome a new start in theology by which she began to recover from the extreme embarrassments she found herself in, was no less than Gotthold Ephraim Lessing.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ O. Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge, 1957), p. 39.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁴⁸ J. Ranft, *Der Ursprung des katholischen Traditionsprinzips*, (Würzburg, 1931), p. 144.

In his "Necessary answer to a very unnecessary question of Herr Hauptpastor Goetze in Hamburg" Lessing attacked the Lutheranism of his day by striking at its foundation, the Bible. He argued that oral tradition, the *regula fidei*, preceded the Bible, that many Christians had been saved without the Bible, that this early confession is the rock on which the church was built, not the Bible.⁴⁹ The first Protestant who saw in this viewpoint an escape from the devastating results of Biblical criticism was Eichhorn, who began to study the gospels on the presupposition that they are the results of, and are formed by, oral tradition. He thereby became a kind of precursor to form criticism, which modern Roman Biblical scholars have developed with great skill and profit.

In Roman theology Sailer combined the Lessing insight with Fénelon's concept of living tradition. Thus was begun a direction of thought which flourished in the Tübingen school under the Tübingen greats: Drey, Moehler, Kuhn, Doellinger. Forced into controversy with his Protestant colleague Baur, Drey appropriated Hegelian insights to argue that revelation is dialectically and dynamically developed in the living history and life of the church. The Bible is a part of tradition, but extra-canonical sources also contribute to this development. Moehler, under similar influences, advanced the thought of his teacher. In *The Unity of the Church* he argued that tradition is the Gospel of the apostles, that faith is not the servile submission to some authority, but that it imposes itself upon the believer and is self-validating. These ideas combined with

⁴⁹ Lessing's *Theological Writings*, trans. H. Chadwick (Stanford, 1957), pp. 62 ff.

a high and romantic view of the church to enable the Tübingen theologians to accept a great deal of critical history. But still in Moehler, romanticism, argues Father Geiselmann, prevented him from achieving a complete unity of Scripture and tradition, for the church did somehow add something to the Bible, thus not wholly freeing the concept of tradition from an incremental function. It was the greatest of the Tübingen men, Moehler's pupil Johann Kuhn, who finally overcame the *partim . . . partim* idea. Kuhn began his career as an exegete and later became a dogmatician. Since tradition was the living transmission of revelation, borne by the community, the Scriptures were the literary deposit of this. The Scriptures were materially sufficient; all explication of dogma in the church is rooted in them; nothing can develop which does not have its premise or *Anknüpfungspunkt* in the canon. Thus the sufficiency of Scripture is declared in the sense of Vincent of Lerins, and a kind of classical unity is achieved (cf. the exact parallel development in the Lutheran Erlangen School). The tradition lives on and unfolds in the preaching of the church.⁵⁰

But the general retreat of Christianity on all fronts had accelerated the ultramontane tendencies already strongly represented in Trent. The great theological spirit behind the *Vaticanum* was Franzelin.⁵¹ He pressed for a greater precision in the definition of tradition, distinguishing for the first time explicitly between *traditiones* (tradition in the passive sense) referring to doctrines or truths objectively stated, and *traditio* (in the active sense)

referring to the living and authoritative transmission in the church. This enabled him to emphasize the magisterial function of the church. He denied that the church promulgated new revelations. The Spirit assists the teaching of the church, does not inspire.

This is the main thrust of the Vatican decree also. The *Vaticanum* reaffirmed Trent (*sessio III, c. 2*) and emphasized the magisterial function of the church, particularly that of the Supreme Pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedra* (*sessio IV, c. 4*). But by failing to define *ex cathedra* the *Vaticanum* did not close the door to further discussion of Scripture and tradition. Following the distinction of Franzelin between the active and passive sense, theological debate in Roman circles continues over the relationship between *traditiones* and *traditio*. This is substantially the same debate which we witnessed at Trent between supporters of apostolic tradition and supporters of ecclesiastical tradition. Is the *traditio* controlled by, or does it control, the *traditiones*? Can the *traditio* be corrected by a more accurate and fuller apprehension of the *traditiones*? The antimodernist encyclicals did not really close this debate, for they were chiefly concerned with excesses in the theory of doctrinal development which, in Rome's opinion, gave individual and corporate experience too decisive a role as a source in the development of dogma.

A recent example of the continuation of the Tridentine discussion has appeared in the first issue of the new theological journal from Montreal, *Studia Montis Regii*. Gerard Owens, C.S.S.R., of Assumption University, Windsor, Ontario, undertakes to answer the celebrated French Jesuit

⁵⁰ I depend for my summary upon Geiselmann, pp. 14—21. See n. 38 above.

⁵¹ A. Michel, *Op. cit.*, col. 1336.

Jean Daniélou.⁵² Daniélou is well-known for his published discussions with Oscar Cullman on the subject of Scripture and tradition,⁵³ and he has formulated a position which seems unsatisfactory to his critic Owens.

Daniélou poses the question: "Once we have admitted that Tradition and Scripture are the two sources of Revelation, by which the message of Christ is transmitted to us . . . are these two sources merely two different ways by which a single truth is transmitted to us? Or rather have they a distinct content in such wise that certain truths are transmitted by Scripture but other revealed truths omitted by Scripture are transmitted to us by Tradition alone?"

Daniélou's answer to the second question is negative. Owens responds in his article entitled "Is All Revelation Contained in Sacred Scripture?"

There are three major objections to Daniélou's position, Owens contends. First, the truth of the canonicity and inspiration of Scripture cannot be derived from Scripture itself. A second objection concerns the five sacraments usually rejected by Protestants as non-Scriptural. It would be extremely difficult to establish these from Scripture alone. The third objection includes the dogmas relating to Mariology. Especially the doctrine of Mary's intimate

⁵² G. Owens, "Is All Revelation Contained in Sacred Scripture?" *Studia Montis Regii*, I (1958), 55—60.

⁵³ This important debate on Scripture and tradition, carried on sympathetically by a Protestant and a Roman Catholic, may be studied in English in O. Cullmann, *The Early Church*, trans. A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951), pp. 59 to 99; and in J. Daniélou, *God and the Ways of Knowing*, trans. W. Roberts (New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1957), pp. 174—217.

association with Christ in redemption would be difficult to establish from Scripture alone.

Owens concludes: "The more one thinks of the complete corpus of Catholic doctrine, the more does the restriction of the content of Tradition as a source to co-extension with that of Scripture, appear to be a mirage. . . . It is certainly praiseworthy to remove any unwarranted obstacles to the path of reunion, but it seems questionable, to say the least, whether any approximation to the 'scriptura sola' is a step in the right direction."

This exchange could almost literally have been excerpted from the minutes of the Council of Trent. In view of the narrowing and consequent distortion of authentic Christian tradition, which has constituted the main theological direction of Rome since Trent, it must appear curious to many that such discussion is still alive within the Roman communion.⁵⁴ And yet such controversy is inevitable in view of the significant revival of Biblical and patristic studies within Roman Catholicism.⁵⁵

These developments would be sure grounds for great optimism if one were not saddened by certain dominant trends

⁵⁴ The most recent analysis of this problem by a Roman Catholic deals again with the Council of Trent. Conclusions supporting my general interpretation of the council as well as the theological position of Daniélou are presented by H. Holstein, "La Tradition d'après le Concile de Trente," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XLVII (Juillet-Septembre 1959), 367 to 390.

⁵⁵ E. B. Koenker, "The New Role of the Scriptures in Roman Catholicism," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, X (August 1958), 248—254, shows that in addition to the great renewal of Bible studies on a scholarly level there is also an important movement encouraging Bible study on the level of the parishes.

in Mariology as exemplified by the recent Dogma of the Assumption. There seems to be a certain irreversibility in Roman Catholicism which constitutes a grave problem for all who view evangelical developments within this communion with sympathy.

At the same time we must be grateful for, and attentive to, the lifeblood of the Gospel that still flows within sclerotic Roman veins.⁵⁶ We must never underestimate the renewing power of the Word of God, no matter what the circumstances of history.

* * *

This study has principally dealt with the Council of Trent and has neglected parallel Protestant developments. These may be described at another time. We may now attempt some concluding observations which will try to place our results into the context of the current theological situation.

The problem of Scripture and tradition is part of a whole complex of questions, such as the nature of the church and the nature of authority within the church. In the past the question of the relationship between Scripture and tradition has been formulated on the presupposition that these were two competing and mutually exclusive realities. The new formulation of the question which is developing both within Roman Catholicism and Protestantism tends to link Scripture and tradition *hermeneutically*. The basic question seems to be: What is involved in bridging the gap between the *then* of revelation and the *now* of the life of the church? The Bible is not a dead book, but continues to live in

the act of reading, contemplation, proclamation, interpretation. This is accomplished in the living context of the church, which under the guidance of the Spirit is shaped by the message of the Bible and, in turn, supports it and shapes its proclamation.

The question of tradition, then, as it is being raised in modern theology, deals with the presuppositions and influential factors at work as a reader weighs, elaborates, and connects the various data of Biblical revelation. In short, we are dealing with the very heart of theology, the exposition of the Scripture.

To illuminate this question rather than to provide answers, we may call attention to merely two of these influential factors which make their presence felt in the interpretation of the Bible. The historic doctrinal decisions, embodied in the creeds and confessions, are always at work supplying the presuppositions and doctrinal framework for interpreters who accept these decisions as dogmatically binding. Another instance would be the influence of the great doctors of the church. For example, can we really understand the exegesis current in the Missouri Synod apart from the specific heritage of Luther, Gerhardt, Walther, Pieper, and Stoeckhardt, to mention only a few? The expositor is always in some sense indebted to the great teachers who preceded him.

A question which may be raised in this connection is the traditional assertion of the principle that the Scripture interprets itself. Of course, this principle sets certain conditions which the interpreter must obey, but within those conditions the process of apprehension and interpretation continues.

My observations on the new form of the

⁵⁶ The problematics of Protestant-Roman Catholic dialogs are discussed by J. Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1959).

old problem of Scripture and tradition are partly in anticipation of what we think will happen and partly a recognition of a trend already evident. If this becomes a major trend and development, we may hope that interconfessional dialog will turn more and more to matters of Biblical exposition. One can observe this new situation already in various theological disci-

pines. For example, the church fathers are now being studied not so much as metaphysical theologians but principally as Biblical expositors. Thus the study of patristic exegesis is one concrete field in which Protestant and Roman Catholic studies are converging with mutual benefit and illumination.

Valparaiso, Ind.

ADDENDUM

The text of 22 March is the initial draft; the text of 8 April is the final decree. Words omitted or added in the course of the debate are in italics. An English translation is appended.

Text Presented on 22 March

Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina synodus in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata praesidentibus in ea eisdem tribus Apostolicae sedis legatis, hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens ut sublati erroribus puritas ipsa Evangelii *Dei* conservetur, quod promissum ante per prophetas ejus in Scripturis sanctis Dominus noster J. C. *ejus filius* proprio ore primum promulgavit, deinde per suos apostolos tanquam *regulam* omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinae omni creaturae praedicari iussit, perspiciensque hanc veritatem *partim* contineri in libris scriptis *partim* sine scripto traditionibus, quae vel ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptae vel ab ipsis apostolis Spiritu sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae ad nos usque pervenerunt: orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta omnes libros tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas tanquam vel oretenus a Christo vel a Spiritu sancto dictatas et continua successione in Ecclesia catholica conservatas, *quibus* pietatis debetur affectus, summa cum reverentia pro sacris et canonice suscepit et veneratur, suscipi et ab omnibus Christi fidelibus statuit et decernit. Omnes itaque intelligent quo ordine et via ipsa synodus post iactum

fidei confessionis fundamentum sit progressura et quibus potissimum testimonii ac praesidiis in *constituendis* dogmatibus et instaurandis in Ecclesia moribus sit usura. (The list of canonical books follows.)

Final Text of 8 April

Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina synodus in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata praesidentibus in ea eisdem tribus Apostolicae sedis legatis, hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens ut sublati erroribus puritas ipsa Evangelii *in Ecclesia* conservetur, quod promissum ante per prophetas in Scripturis sanctis Dominus noster J. C. *Dei Filius*, proprio ore primum promulgavit, deinde per suos apostolos tanquam *fontem* omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinae, omni creaturae praedicari iussit: perspiciensque, hanc veritatem et *disciplinam* contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptae, aut ipsis apostolis, Spiritu sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt, orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum *ad fidem*, tum *ad mores pertinentes*, tanquam vel oretenus a Christo vel a Spiritu sancto

dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur [the list of canonical books follows]. . . . Omnes itaque intelligent quo ordine et via ipsa synodus post iactum fidei confessionis fundamentum, sit progressura et quibus potissimum testimoniis ac praesidiis in *confirmandis* dogmatis et instaurandis in Ecclesia moribus sit usura.

The Text of 22 March

The holy, ecumenical and general council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding, keeps this constantly in view, namely, that the purity of the Gospel of *God* may be preserved after the errors have been removed. This [Gospel], of old proclaimed through the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, *His Son*, promulgated first with His own mouth, and then commanded it to be preached by His Apostles to every creature as the *rule* at once of all saving truth and norms of conduct. It also clearly perceives that this truth is contained *partly* in the written books and *partly* in the unwritten traditions, which, received *either* by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand. Following, then, the examples of the orthodox fathers, it receives and venerates with the highest reverence *as sacred and canonical* all the books both of the Old and New Testaments, since one God is the Author of both; also the traditions, *to which is due* an equal feeling of piety as having been dictated either orally by Christ or by the Holy Ghost and preserved in the Catholic Church in unbroken succession; *and orders and decrees that these*

be received by all the faithful of Christ. Let all understand, therefore, in what order and manner the council, after having laid the foundation of the confession of faith, will proceed, and who are the chief witnesses and supports to whom it will appeal in establishing dogmas and in restoring morals in the church. (The list of canonical books follows.)

The Final Text, Approved 8 April

(This translation is essentially the Schroeder translation provided with his edition of the text. I have made some modifications.)

The holy, ecumenical and general council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding, keeps this constantly in view, namely, that the purity of the Gospel may be preserved *in the Church* after the errors have been removed. This [Gospel], of old promised through the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, *the Son of God*, promulgated first with His own mouth, and then commanded it to be preached by His Apostles to every creature as the *source* at once of all saving truth and norms of conduct. It also clearly perceives that this truth and *rule* are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions, which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand. Following, then, the examples of the orthodox Fathers, it receives and venerates with a feeling of equal piety and reverence all the books both of the Old and New Testaments, since one God is the author of both; also the traditions, *whether they relate to faith or morals*, as having been dictated either orally by Christ or by

the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church in unbroken succession. (There follows a list of the sacred books.) . . . Let all understand, therefore, in what order and manner the council, after having

laid the foundation of the confession of faith, will proceed, and who are the chief witnesses and supports to whom it will appeal in confirming dogmas and in restoring morals in the Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Cano, M. *De locis theologicis*, in *Melchioris Cani opera*. Madrid, 1734.
Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, trans. H. J. Schroeder. New York, 1955.
 Chemnitz, Martin. *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, ed. Ed. Preuss. Berlin, 1861.
Concilium Tridentinum, ed. Societas Goerresiana. Freiburg, 1901.
 De Castro, A. *Adversus haereses*, Lib. I. Basel, 1534.
 Fisher, J. *Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio*. Coloniae, 1553.
Lessing's Theological Writings, trans. H. Chadwick. Stanford, 1957.

Secondary Sources

Beumer, J. "Das Katholische Schriftprinzip in der theologischen Literatur der Scholastik bis zur Reformation," *Scholastik*, XVI (1941).
 Chadwick, O. *From Bossuet to Newman*. Cambridge, 1957.
 Cullmann, O. *The Early Church*, trans. A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman. Philadelphia, 1951.
 Daneffé, A. *Der Traditionsbegriff*. Münster, 1931.
 Daniélou, J. *God and the Ways of Knowing*, trans. W. Roberts. New York, 1957.
 Elert, W. *Morphologie des Luthertums*, I. Munich, 1931.
 Geiselmann, J. R. "Das Missverständnis über das Verhältnis von Schrift und Tradition und seine Überwindung in der katholischen Theologie," *Schrift und Tradition*, ed. T. Ellwein. Bad Boll, 1956.
 Holstein, H. "La Tradition d'après le Concile de Trente," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XLVII (Juillet—Septembre 1959).
 Koenker, E. B. "The New Role of Scriptures in Roman Catholicism," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, X (August 1958).
 Koopmans, J. *Das Altkirchliche Dogma in der Reformation*. Munich, 1955.
 Kropatscheck, F. *Das Schriftprinzip der Lutherischen Kirche*. Leipzig, 1904.
 Leeuwan, A. van. "L'Église, règle de foi, dans les écrits de Guillaume d'Occam," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, XI (Jan—Jun 1934).
 Lodrioo, J. "La notion de tradition dans la théologie de Jean Driedo de Louvain," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, XXVI (Jan—Jun 1950).
 Michel, A. "Tradition," *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, ed. E. Amann and others, XV. Paris, 1903.
 Ortigues, E. "Écritures et Traditions Apostoliques au Concile de Trente," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XXXVI (Avril, Mai, Juin 1949).
 Owens, G. "Is All Revelation Contained in Sacred Scripture?" *Studia Montis Regii*, I (1958).
 Pelikan, J. *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*. New York, 1959.
 —. "Tradition in Confessional Lutheranism," *Lutheran World*, III (December 1956).
 Polman, P. *L'Élément Historique dans la Controverse Religieuse du XVleme Siècle*. Gembloux, 1932.
 Ranft, J. *Der Ursprung des Katholischen Traditionsprinzips*. Würzburg, 1931.
 Schmidt, K. D. *Studien zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*. Tübingen, 1925.
 Seeberg, R. *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*, II, trans. C. E. Hay. Grand Rapids, 1952.
 Smalley, B. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. New York, 1952.
 Tavard, G. "A Forgotten Theology of Inspiration: Nikolaus Ellenbog's Refutation of 'Scriptura Sola,'" *Franciscan Studies*, XV (June 1955).
 —. "Holy Church or Holy Writ: a Dilemma of the Fourteenth Century," *Church History*, XXIII (September 1954).

The Sixteenth-Century "Confessyon of the Fayth of the Germaynes" in Twentieth-Century American English

By HERBERT J. A. BOUMAN

THE same year in which Martin Bucer and his associates met with Martin Luther and his co-workers to establish agreement, at least for the moment, between the two groups of Evangelicals in the Wittenberg Concord, the rediscovered Gospel, which these men loved and proclaimed so well, was brought to another country. Just six years after Augsburg, a mere five after the Editio Princeps of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, a book came off the press in England with the following imprint on the title page: "The confessyon of the fayth of the Germaynes exhibited to the most victorious Emperour Charles the .v. in the Councell or assemble holden at Augusta the yere of our lorde. 1530. To which is added the Apologie of Melanchthon who defendeth with reasons iuincible the aforesayde confessyon translated by Richarde Taverner at the commaundement of his Master the ryght honorable Mayster Thomas Crumwel chefe Secretarie to the kynges grace. Psalmo. 119. And I speake of thy testimonies in the presēce of kynges and I was not confounded."¹ Following the text of the confession we find this: "Imprynted at London in Fletestrete/by me Robert Redman/dwellynge at the sygne of the George nexte to saynt Dunstones

Church. 1536. CUM PRIVILEGIO RE-GALI."

A momentous occasion! Taverner writes in his Preface: "Who cā nat onles he be mortally infected with the pestyferous poyson of enuy most hyghly commende magnifye and extolle your ryght honorable mastershippes most circūspecte godlynes and most godly circumspetion in the cause and matter of our Christyan religyon whiche with all indifferencie do not onely permitte the pure true and sincere preachers of godes worde frely to preache/but also your selfe to the vtermoste of your power do promote and furder the cause of Christe and nat only that/but also do animate and incourage other to the same. As nowe of late ye haue animated and impelled me to translate the Confessyon of the faythe and the defence or Apologie of the same/which boke after the judgeamente and censure of all indifferente wyse and lerned men is as frutful and as clerky composed as ever boke was vnyll thys day whiche haue bene publyshed or sette forth. But to thende that the people for whose sakes thys boke was commaunded to be translated maye the more gredely deuoure the same/I do dedicate and commende it to your name/and yf any faultes haue eschaped me in this my translation I desyr nat onely your maystershype but also all that shal reade thys boke to remember the saying of the poete Horace which ī arte

¹ This book is in the British Museum. The present quotation and others to follow are from a microfilm copy in Pritzlaff Memorial Library, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

poerica saythe. In opere longo fas est orepere somnum. That is to saye/in a longe worke it is lawefull for an man to fall some tymes a slepe. But as touchyng your ryght honorable maystershippe I doubte nothyng (such is your inestimable humanite) but that ye wyll accepte thys my lytle seruyce & take it in worth whom I beseche the hyght god that he wyll vouchsaue to furder in all your affayres to the glorie of god and auauement of hys name. Amen."

The "faythe of the Germaynes." In a sense this was certainly true. Germany was the cradle of the great Reformation. The names of the places connected with those stirring days and events betray their national geography: Eisleben, Eisenach, Erfurt, Wittenberg, Heidelberg, Leipzig, Worms, Marburg, Schwabach, Augsburg. The same is true of the men chiefly involved: Luther, Melanchthon, Jonas, Bugenhagen, etc. Those who presented the statement of their faith in the German language on German soil at a German diet were German princes. There was indeed a distinctly German flavor about it all.

But in a more important sense the "faythe of the Germaynes" was not really German at all. The very fact of the confession's early translation into English and its highly commendatory introduction to the subjects of Henry VIII demonstrates the more than German character of this book. The particular form of the confession may have been German, but its content is as old as the mercy of God and His redemptive activity on behalf of the sinner, as old as the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ for us men and for our salvation and the divinely powered kerygma of the apostles. It is the faith that the true church

has always believed and confessed, the faith in the Gospel of the free grace of God. It is the faith that had long been obscured but was rediscovered by Martin Luther, transmitted to his associates, and gloriously confessed by the strong men of Augsburg. The "faythe of the Germaynes" was thus no Teutonic peculiarity, representing an idiosyncrasy of the German character. It was not a "Lutheran" document² and hence of doubtful or limited relevance for Christians of other lands and tongues. For just as from the beginning the Gospel addressed itself with its universal gift to all men, recognizing no national, ethnic, racial, or linguistic barriers, so the rediscovered Gospel, to which the Lutheran Confessions bear witness, is not peculiar to one people or one age. Here, too, there is neither German nor Frenchman, neither Slav nor Scandinavian, neither Slovak nor Pole, neither Spaniard nor Englishman.³

And this is true not only of the Old World but also of the New. The Lutheran Church came to America and gradually established itself on a solid confessional basis. Every Lutheran body in America in some way expresses allegiance to the Lutheran Confessions. Transplanted to its new environment the Lutheran Church survived and maintained itself and grew and prospered until it has become a significant force in American Christendom. And this under a democratic form of government and with a congregational church polity, quite independent of princes and church-state alignments. The Lutheran confes-

² Cf. Ap XV 42 ". . . imo hanc saluberrimam evangelii partem lacerant convitiis," which Justus Jonas paraphrases in the German, ". . . dieselbigen seligen Lehre, das liebe, heilige Evangelium, nennen sie lutherisch."

³ Cf. Acts 2:9 ff.; Gal. 3:26 ff.

sional approach to Christian doctrine proved itself as flexible and adaptable to changed external circumstances as the apostolic Gospel itself. Only in periods when Lutheran confessionalism wavered and became unsure of itself was the Lutheran Church in America in danger of losing its identity.

In America, as in Europe and elsewhere, the fortunes of the Lutheran Church are indissolubly linked with the Lutheran Symbols. The Lutheran immigrants from Germany, the Scandinavian lands, and other European countries brought their symbols with them and used them for generations in the language of their national origin. But the Lutheran Church was bound to remain an immigrant and even a "foreign" church unless and until it could communicate the foundations of its faith to Americans in the American idiom. "Wrapped in the obscurities of its original dialects—the Latin and the German languages—that venerable relic of the Reformation has been left to slumber almost entirely in silence and neglect. . . . The most obvious cause . . . seems to be, that the larger portion of Lutherans in America are accustomed to read the English language only, and consequently have never had an opportunity to appreciate the value of their Symbols. Yet we cherish the anticipation of a brighter day in the Lutheran Church. . . . It was, therefore, reasonable to presume, that a faithful translation of the Book of Concord into the English language, was loudly demanded by the necessities of the times, and would effectually co-operate with these laudable exertions."⁴

These statements from the Publishers' Preface of the oldest complete *Book of Concord* in English were written under date of July 4, 1851. In the little more than a century since then "a brighter day" has indeed dawned for the dissemination of the Lutheran Symbols among English-speaking Americans. Apart from the Augsburg Confession, of which the first complete English version in America dates from 1831, the translations of the entire *Book of Concord* are as follows:

The Christian Book of Concord

Newmarket, Va., 1851.

Book of Concord. Philadelphia, 1882

Concordia Triglotta, St. Louis, 1921

⁵ *Book of Concord*, Philadelphia, 1959.

All of these editions stand in the same translation tradition, as is acknowledged by the various editors and as could easily be demonstrated by a comparison of the texts. But even the early British translations were not without influence on the American efforts. Charles Porterfield Krauth, a great 19th century American leader in confessional Lutheranism, did much to popularize the Lutheran Symbols and their theology. His work appears to rest, at least with

5 In addition to the Henkel edition: (a) *The Book of Concord, or The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. Henry Eyster Jacobs (Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board, MCMXIX, first edition, 1882). (b) *Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church, German-Latin-English*, ed. F. Bente and W. H. T. Dau. Published as a Memorial of the Quadrcentenary Jubilee of the Reformation, anno Domini 1917, by resolution of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921). (c) *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, trans. and ed. Theodore G. Tappert in collaboration with Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, Arthur C. Piepkorn (Muhlenberg Press: Philadelphia, 1959).

⁴ *The Christian Book of Concord, or Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Newmarket, Va.: Published by Solomon D. Henkel and Bros., 1851). Preface, p. iii.

respect to the Augsburg Confession, on a 16th-century British model.⁶ A comparison of some of the articles in four English versions will show some renderings peculiar to each, yet they display a remarkable similarity over all. The basic text for all of them is the Latin.⁷ They will be labeled, respectively, T (Taverner, 1536), J (Jacobs, 1882), Tr (Triglot, 1921), and M (Muhlenberg, 1959).

AUGSBURG CONFESSTION, ARTICLE I

T—Of the Trinite. Our Churches with full cōsent do teache that the decree of Nicene Councell touchyng the vnyte of the Godhede or diuine essencie and of the. iii. parsons is true & ought to be beleued without any doutyng/ that is to saye/ that there is one deitie or diuine essencie which is both called and is in dede God/ euerlastinge without bodie without partes/ vnmesurable i power wysdome and goodnes/ the maker and preseruer of all things as wel visible as inuisible and yet be. iii. distinckte parsons of all one godhede or essencie and of all one power and whiche be coeternal/ that is to saye the father sonne and holy ghost. And this worde (parson) they vse in the same signification that other doctours of the church haue in thyss mater vsed it/ so that it signifyeth not a parte or qualitie in an other/ but yt which hath a proper beinge of it selfe.

⁶ Cf. Jacobs (n. 5 above), p. 4: "The translations included in this volume are those of the two-volume edition [1882], except that, for the translation of the Augsburg Confession, credited in that edition to Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, but which is in reality a reprint of a sixteenth century English translation, published in 'The Harmony of the Confessions' in 1586. . . ."

⁷ The Henkel, or Newmarket, edition is translated from the German and can therefore not be used for comparison with Taverner.

J—Our Churches, with common consent, do teach, that the decree of the Council of Nicaea concerning the Unity of the Divine Essence and concerning the Three Persons, is true and to be believed without any doubting; that is to say, there is one Divine Essence which is called and which is God: eternal, without body, without parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible; and yet there are three Persons, of the same essence and power, who also are co-eternal, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. And the term "person" they use as the Fathers have used it, to signify, not a part or quality in another, but that which subsists of itself.

Tr—(an exact reproduction of the Jacobs text).

M—Our churches teach with great unanimity that the decree of the Council of Nicaea concerning the unity of the divine essence and concerning the three persons is true and should be believed without any doubting. That is to say, there is one divine essence, which is called and which is God, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. Yet there are three persons, of the same essence and power, who are also coeternal: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And this term "person" is used, as the ancient Fathers employed it in this connection, to signify not a part or a quality in another but that which subsists of itself.

AUGSBURG CONFESSTION, ARTICLE III

T—Of the humanitie and diuinitie of Christe. Also they teache that the worde (that is to saye) the sonne of god dyd take mans nature in the wōbe of the blessed virgyne Marie/ so that there be

on con-
the Coun-
y of the
e Three
ed with-
there is
led and
t body,
wisdom,
erver of
and yet
ame es-
ternal,
Ghost.
as the
t a part
ch sub-

of the

in great
Council
of the
e three
believed
to say,
s called
sporeal,
m, and
of all
ere are
ce and
Father,
nd this
ancient
ection,
in an-
self.

III
titie of
worde
od dyd
of the
ere be

two natures/ a diuine nature & an humane nature in vnitie of parson inseparably conioyned and knytte/ one Christe/ truely god/ and truely man/ borne of the virginie Marie/ truly sufferinge his passion/ crucifyed/ dead/ and buryed/ to thentent to bryngē vs agayne into fauour with the father almyghty/ and to thentent to be a sacrifice and host nat only for Original synnes/ but also for all actuall synnes of men. The same Christ went downe to the helles . . .

J — Also they teach, that the Word, that is, the Son of God, did take man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that there are Two Natures, the divine and the human, inseparably conjoined in one Person, one Christ, true God and true man, who was born of the Virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, that he might reconcile the Father unto us, and be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but for all actual sins of men. He also descended into hell. . . .

Tr — duplicate of J, except that it substitutes "assume" for "take."

M — Our churches also teach that the Word — that is, the Son of God — took on man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin Mary. So there are two natures, divine and human, inseparably conjoined in the unity of his person, one Christ, true God and true man, who was born of the virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, that he might reconcile the Father to us and be a sacrifice not only for original guilt but also for all actual sins of men. He also descended into hell. . . .

AUGSBURG CONFESION, ARTICLE IV

T — of iustifycation. Also they teache that men can nat be made ryghtuous in the syght of God by theyr owne proper

powers merites or workes/ but yt they be freely iustifyed for Christes sake throughē fayth/ when they beleue that they be takē agayn into fauour and that theyr synnes be forgyuen for Christes sake/ who with his deth hath satisfied for our synnes. Thys faythe god reputeth and taketh in stede of ryghtwysnes before hym. As Paule teacheth in the thyrdē & fourth chapiters to the Romans.

J — Also they teach, that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works, but are freely justified for Christ's sake through faith, when they believe that they are received into favor and that their sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, who, by His death, hath made satisfaction for our sins. This faith God imputes for righteousness in His sight. Rom. 3 and 4.

Tr — virtually identical with J.

M — Our churches also teach that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works but are freely justified for Christ's sake through faith when they believe that they are received into favor and that their sins are forgiven on account of Christ, who by his death made satisfaction for our sins. This faith God imputes for righteousness in his sight (Rom. 3, 4).

AUGSBURG CONFESION, ARTICLE X

T — Of the sacramēt of the Aulter. Of the souper of the lorde they teach that the bodie and blode of Christe be verely present and be distributed to the eaters ī the souper or maūdy of the lorde and dysproue them that teache other wyse.

J — Of the Supper of the Lord, they teach, that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord; and they disapprove of those that teach otherwise.

Tr — Slightly different punctuation and the substitution of "reject" for "disapprove." Otherwise the same as J.

M — Our churches teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord. They disapprove of those who teach otherwise.

Since the Henkel text and Muhlenberg both offer translations of the German, a brief comparison between these two may be presented:

H — A.C. IX: Respecting baptism it is taught, that it is necessary; that grace is offered through it; and that children also ought to be baptized, who through such baptism are presented to God, and become pleasing to him.

Therefore the Anabaptists are condemned, who teach that infant baptism is not proper.

M — It is taught among us that Baptism is necessary and that grace is offered through it. Children, too, should be baptized, for in Baptism they are committed to God and become acceptable to him.

On this account the Anabaptists who teach that infant Baptism is not right are rejected.

Finally, a sample from the Formula of Concord, at random:

EPICTOME VII, 12

H — The second: — That the right hand of God is everywhere, at which Christ, according to his human nature, is seated, in deed and in truth, and reigns present, and has in his hands and under his feet, all that is in heaven and on earth; where no man nor angel, but the Son of Mary alone, is seated; hence he is also able to perform that which we assert.

J — The second: That God's right hand is everywhere; at which Christ is in deed and in truth placed according to his hu-

man nature, [and therefore] being present rules, and has in his hands and beneath his feet everything that is in heaven and on earth [as Scripture says (Eph. 1:22)]; There [at this right hand of God] no man else, or angel, but only the Son of Mary, is placed; whence he can effect this [those things which we have said].

Tr — Almost identical with J.

M — The second ground is: God's right hand is everywhere. Christ, really and truly set at this right hand of God according to his human nature, rules presently and has in his hands and under his feet everything in heaven and on earth. No other human being, no angel, but only Mary's Son, is so set down at the right hand of God, whence he is able to do these things.

It would appear that the English renderings of the *Triglot* are the least original of them all. F. Bente, one of the editors, acknowledges that his English text rests "chiefly" on that of Jacobs.⁸

Although none of the versions presents any particular difficulty to understanding, and although all of them undoubtedly communicated well enough to their time, none but the last rolls quite smoothly off the mid-twentieth-century American tongue or falls quite harmoniously on the ear. Translation of foreign thoughts and foreign words is never a simple task, but it is grueling labor. According to the tired but still true cliché, a work "loses something in translation," either in idiom or content, or both. Within these limitations all prior versions were praiseworthy achievements. Unique in its field is the trilingual edition of the *Triglot Concordia*. But all former translations, including the *Triglot*, were

⁸ Cf. *Triglot*, Preface, p. iii.

prep
and
new
affec
new
resu
refle
the
fessi
T
than
accu
issue
of T
expe
guis
ther
Jaro
korn
prod
of C
Conc
pred
laton
mira
idion
pred
zon.
with

9
luther
jahr
3. v
hoech

10
Matte
in th
of G
dent,
consi
Frede
Louis
Mayer

prepared before a vast amount of critical and historical study and some significant new manuscript discoveries, particularly affecting the Augsburg Confession, shed new light on both text and content. The results of these valuable new researches are reflected in the magnificent monument to the quadricentennial of the Augsburg Confession, the so-called *Jubiläumsausgabe* of the Lutheran Symbols.⁹

The latest translation, appearing less than a year ago, had the benefit of all the accumulated scholarly studies since the issue of the *Triglot*. Under the editorship of Theodore Tappert, Lutheran scholar and experienced translator, a team of distinguished experts from among American Lutheran scholars, namely, Robert H. Fischer, Jaroslav J. Pelikan, and Arthur Carl Piepkorn, collaborated with the editor in the production of this modern American *Book of Concord*.¹⁰ In my opinion the new Concordia deserves to supersede all its predecessors from Taverner on. The translators have in the main combined an admirable fidelity to content with felicity in idiom. Standing on the shoulders of their predecessors they could see a farther horizon. Brief historical introductions, together with a footnote apparatus, facilitate reading

with understanding. In view of the official character of both Latin and German texts in the Augsburg Confession, both are offered in complete translation. Most prior versions rested either on the Latin alone or offered a combination, by means of bracketed interpolations, of both texts, a practice which frequently impeded reading. All other symbols in this new edition are translations of the respective originals, the Apology and the Treatise, or Tractate, from the Latin, the Smalcald Articles, Luther's Catechisms, and the Formula of Concord from the German. Important variations are noted in the apparatus. Comprehensive textual and topical indexes provide invaluable aids to systematic study. The four translators cannot be expected to speak English in precisely the same way, and therefore certain stylistic levels even beyond the disparities in the original authors were inevitable. In spite of this, the collaborators have achieved a high plateau of general excellence. The 16th-century "faythe of the Germaynes" now speaks to 20th-century American Christians with remarkable freshness and vigor.

Yet this book must not be the last word, even for our time. Our generation may not require major revisions, but public demand for this book should be so great and continuous that frequent reprints should be necessary, affording frequent opportunities for improvement. There will be no need for belaboring minutiae, such as typographical errors, the occasional omission of a phrase from the original,¹¹ here and there

⁹ Die *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, herausgegeben im Gedenk-jahr der Augsburgischen Konfession 1930; 3. verbesserte Auflage (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

¹⁰ The translation efforts of the late John C. Mattes, beginning with 1940, are acknowledged in the Foreword, p. v. I owe it to the researches of Geo. Nickelsburg, Concordia Seminary student, to be able to call attention also to the considerable preliminary activities of the late Frederick E. Mayer, Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, in promotion of the translation project. Mayer's efforts were brought into relation to the work of Mattes.

¹¹ E. g., Tr. 72, p. 332, omits the important phrase from the original, "adhibitis suis pasto-ribus." The translation of SA III II 4, p. 303, has no equivalent for the original, "mit Furchten und allem." The explanation of the Second Article in Luther's Small Catechism uses the

a dubious choice of words. The alert reader will catch these items himself. More important is the omission of the Catalog of Testimonies, which played a considerable role in Lutheran Christological discussions and was included in the earliest editions of the *Book of Concord*. This omission is a regrettable oversight, but one which could easily be remedied in future editions. One could debate the adequacy of the rather sparse historical introductions as well as of the footnotes, depending on the circle of readers for whom the book is primarily intended. The average layman might want further explanations of the explanations or dispense with them entirely, whereas the serious student might look for fuller reference to the sources. But perhaps the latter would want to go to the critically edited originals anyway.

In the total perspective these are relatively minor strictures, however. They must not be allowed to obscure the very real merits of this work. There is now no excuse for the Lutheran parishioner of average intelligence and education to neglect a study of the historic formulations

verbs "redeemed," "delivered," and "freed," which seem to reproduce the secondary Latin "redemit" and "liberavit" rather than the primary German *erlöst, erworben, gewonnen*. Also, the translation has the order "silver and gold," which is contrary to both the German *Gold oder Silber* and the Latin *auro aut argento*. The subtitle of the Table of Duties, p. 354, speaks of "etlicher Sprüche für allerlei heilige Orden und Stände." There seems to be no cogent reason for the omission of "heilige" in the translation, "for various estates and conditions of men."

of his faith, and certainly there is none for the Lutheran pastor not to incite his people to such study. The quadricentennial of the death of Philip Melanchthon, a major author of Lutheran confessional writings, and the current revival of interest in John Calvin, a signer of the Augsburg Confession and the leader of a major divergence from Lutheranism, should stimulate a genuine resurgence of interest in, and study of, the Lutheran Symbols. But anniversary or no, Lutherans should always be at home in their church's creeds. Lutherans cannot intelligently invite others into their spiritual home or meaningfully inspect the homes of others before they know where they themselves live and before they can appreciate the virile beauties of their own ecclesiastical domicile. However, with the clear voice of their confessions that stand in dynamic continuity with the "universal Christian church," Lutherans are in a singularly advantageous position to speak a constructive word for true ecumenicity. Large sections of the Lutheran Symbols are admirably suitable for private and family devotions. They can be prayed through. Stripped of all that is time-bound and transitory, the Lutheran Symbols speak as freshly and fruitfully, as authoritatively and appealingly, as reverently and relevantly, of the primary issues of our one holy faith amid all the disrupting harassments of our time as they did when they were the "confessyon of the fayth of the Germayne" 400 years ago.

St. Louis, Mo.

"But Right or Wrong—My Architecture"

By GEORGE W. HOYER

WHAT was it that referred to a recently completed building with the words "It looks as if it were designed by Frank Lloyd *Wrong*?" What is right in church architecture is always so much a reflection of a proponent's subjective background and experience that comments such as these are like "My country — may she always be right — but my country, right or wrong." A case made for church architecture is usually a case for *my* architecture.

These notes ricocheted as the reviews on the following three books were being prepared. Comments on the volumes will precede the comment on the issue.

THE CHANGING CHURCH: ITS ARCHITECTURE, ART, AND DECORATION. By Katherine Morrison McClinton. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1957. 144 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

THE MODERN CHURCH. By Edward D. Mills. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1956. 189 pages. Cloth. \$9.75.

RELIGIOUS BUILDINGS FOR TODAY, ed. John Knox Shear. New York: F. W. Dodge Corporation, 1957. 183 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

If one picture is worth more than 1,000 words, these volumes are among the most economical tools building congregations can obtain. The photographs are marvelous, even if you do not agree with all the words. Mrs. McClinton's words say that "the Lutheran Church places the font in

front of the altar" (p. 39), but she *pictures* the ebony and stainless steel font of Christ Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, which is at the end of the north aisle (as Mr. Mills illustrates with a floor plan, although he identifies the church as "Evangelical" [p. 43]). Mrs. McClinton's volume asserts that the Lutheran rules for liturgical colors are "strict and clear" (p. 60), and meanwhile the Ashby printing firm proceeds to publish two calendars to illustrate the variations existing in American Lutheran rites.

The Changing Church is helpful more for pointing up the complexity of the problems involved in the art and decoration of the church than for its solutions. But this is, of course, the best help possible, since each situation needs its own specific solution. One problem, however, which she raises seems to require further comment. "If the minister is bald, the lighting must be regulated so that there are not too many highlights on the bald head" (p. 73). Involved here, one will readily see, is the entire question of ministerial tenure, both of the pate and of the pastorate.

The Modern Church by Edward Mills is somewhat less pertinent for the average building committee because his material speaks out of an English urban background. Thus he makes no comment whatsoever in regard to air conditioning and admonishes that "where a large number of young people are expected to use the buildings, a cycle parking space should be provided to prevent the random parking of bicycles. Provisions should also be made for the

parking of perambulators under cover" (p. 58). His volume is also filled with magnificent pictures of English, European, and American contemporary structures.

Further comment on *Religious Buildings for Today* will follow. The text is of particular value here. It stirs up consideration of points then beautifully illustrated.

All three volumes are excellent examples of the type of material building committees and entire congregations should study before entering upon a church construction program. But for a balanced diet and for some essential roughage, vitamins, and attitudes, committees should still beg, borrow, or buy a copy of Frederick Roth Weber's *The Small Church: How to Build and Furnish It* (Cleveland: J. H. Jansen, 1939). This is obviously another reflection of a personal bias and for reasons indicated in the comments which follow—but "My architecture," I still think she is right!

A major issue that involves the entire discussion of church building concerns the relationship between the architect and the minister. In *Symbolism in the Bible and the Church* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959) Gilbert Cope says: "Building a church is not just another architectural problem: it is not too much to say that an architect should not accept the commission to build a church unless he is a practicing member of the same communion and well versed in the liturgy which it is to serve" (p. 258). It is not too much to ask the same of any minister who engages in a construction program. The problem of a *ministry* that does not really understand the *leitourgia* a church building is to serve is further complicated by a blight that is more frequently discussed in polite architectural circles, a min-

istry that claims too much for its knowledge of architecture.

Otto Spaeth, writing in *Religious Buildings for Today*, says frankly (p. 38): "If our work today is to herald a new age in church building, the first step has to be an open-minded and modest clergy. In simple frankness, the architectural resurrectionism that blights our church plant today is the direct result of profound clerical ignorance of art and architecture, coupled with boundless clerical self-confidence."

Even though the average cleric acknowledges that "the laying on of hands has done nothing at all for his knowledge of air conditioning or central heating" and admits that he is an "architect only by self-confidence," he would protest the judgment were it not for Mr. Spaeth's addition (p. 40):

The architect is in a position to say one word in this struggle. The word is *no*, said with absolute finality. For if an uninformed clergy is the source from whom the blessings of ersatz Gothic flow, in every case there has been an acquiescent architect to provide a canal where he should have placed a dam. With great travail, architecture has lifted itself from the brutish trades to professional status. Does that status mean anything at all? What do we think of a doctor who substitutes for his honest diagnosis the sweet words he knows his patient is longing to hear? Is the architect of wedding-cake churches really any different? The architect is indeed an interpreter, the instrument through which his client's dreams are made incarnate. But if those dreams are nightmares, professional honesty requires that they be shown up as such. When the architect has the courage to say no, more and more ministers of religion

will find the courage to say yes to his working where he wants naturally to work, in the spirit of the present moment.

What is Mr. Spaeth's solution? For the clergy he recommends the introduction of courses in art and architecture on seminary curricula. Mrs. McClinton seconds the idea—"It is easier to train one clergyman in art appreciation than to try to change the tastes of a whole congregation" (p. 132). But should the church architect not also be expected to include courses in theology, worship, and liturgy in his curriculum? Alwin L. Rubin, who was the pastor of Zion Lutheran Church in Portland, Oreg., when Pietro Belluschi was selected as architect, is quoted as follows:

There are architects and architects and choosing between them is not easy. There are some—I sometimes think there are too few of them—who are truly creative. In interviewing architects, pay particular attention to whether a man understands such things as devotional quality and whether he indicates such an understanding without your prodding him. He should firmly believe that this devotional quality will emerge from space, light, color, texture; the right one will quickly and definitely disagree with you if you suggest otherwise. (*Religious Buildings for Today*, p. 34)

In the midst of an actual situation, who is to be responsible for solutions to obvious needs of a parish, and who is to make choices in architecture, art, or decoration? Certainly one ought to lean in the direction of the man who has been trained to qualify. The odds in favor of a successful building operation on this basis are much higher than would be the case if these details and decisions were turned over to the type of building committee of which we read:

"Most building committees are concerned with four things: cost, seating capacity, social rooms and washrooms" (Webber, p. 1). But there are architectural offices that sometimes seem to give no attention to washrooms. There is an eastern sacristy lavatory of recent architectural inspiration whose length seems to indicate it was designed for purposes of meditation like the cloister walks of an old monastery. On the other hand there was the architect in a northern state who insisted that he had "been a member of Grace Church for 35 years and had never been inside the church washroom" and who therefore insisted that there was no necessity for designing one in the building under consideration. Is Mrs. McClinton right in saying: "A building is a work of art and as such must be the work of the artist and not of a committee. Yet the committee and not the architect must take the blame for such practical mistakes (as) . . . no closets for the clergy's vestments" (*The Changing Church*, p. 14). It would seem that a reasonable architect would not insist that his artistry excuses him from a concern for cupboards, and if a committee would suggest that he include them, he ought readily to accede.

But this is not always true. (I speak as a fool—because Mr. Spaeth started this.) At one of the Valparaiso liturgical institutes a question in this area was posed to a silversmith from the Cranbrook School who had addressed the meeting. The point made was that an architect, insisting that every aspect of the school building he was designing be functional, would not accede to the building committee's suggestion that the open-fin radiation which he had designed for the school classrooms be covered

to conceal dust and various things that school boys are wont to hurl. Whose opinion was to decide the issue? The silversmith, speaking for artists and architects, insisted that the architect's opinion should prevail. Are all architects infallible? There are some who can frankly copy a good design and yet manage to develop an interior that seems to be in all things like the original and yet is without everything that the original had in atmosphere and texture. The editor of *Religious Buildings for Today* comments (p. 1):

Our buildings are the expression of our interest in certain fragments of experience, in selected stimuli. At best it is difficult to treat with the whole of any problem. Architects are not alone in their tendency to overlook the evidence of man's total experience in favor of working with those experiences and ideas which happen to be particularly stimulating at the moment. Dealing with parts of experience and parts of ideas is easier. Moreover, by changing periodically the particular set of motivations the illusion of progress may be achieved. . . .

Ralph Adams Cram wanted us to shut out of sight and out of mind all our experience since Gothic. Today's architects are little different from yesterday's. We are simply motivated by a different set of exclusive stimuli. It is a rare architect today who is able to resist the fascination of concentrating his interest on a favorite material, shape or system of construction. Too often it is a predominantly intellectual fascination and as such necessarily fatal for the total interest of the people.

This seems to me to be essentially a fairer attitude toward the position of the architect in the planning of a church. His work, too, needs the judgment and balance which not every architect possesses.

Since this review was initially directed toward those who would prefer to look at pictures rather than read, there are possibly enough still with us who look at the pictures in *Der Lutheraner* and see the record of new church construction in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod which the editor has been preserving for posterity. Many of the designs are somewhat tragic—both in the area of attempted contemporary and in buildings of imitated Gothic. But having seen again in the past summer the Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul abuilding in Washington, D.C., and having stepped once again into Trinity Episcopal Church at Piney Branch and Dahlia in Tacoma Park (pictured in Luther Reed's recent volume, *Worship*, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), designed by the Cathedral architect Philip Hubert Froehman, I would protest against the premise that says:

It seems to me that the first requirement of a church or temple today is that it be of today, contemporary, a structure embracing the total life of the parishioner. That parishioner drives a streamlined car to work in an office or factory where everything has been designed for maximum efficiency and comfort. He travels in streamlined trains and jet-propelled planes. Yet every Sunday he is asked to hurl himself back centuries to say his prayers in the pious gloom of a Gothic or Romanesque past. The queer implication is that God does not exist today; He is made out to be a senile old gentleman dwelling among the antiques of His residence, one whom we visit each week out of sentiment and then forget, since He obviously has no relation to the normal part of our lives.

This comment of Mr. Spaeth in *Religious Buildings for Today* (p. 38) is exem-

plifie
of St
the I
macu
says

oth
the
inc
dra
pu
wi
zar
sol
tur
ma
no
exp
ma

diff
alb
and
dat
ing
in
the
au
sol
a
on
ch
me
at
exp

Th
ever,
much
archi
nent
struc
proac
to hi

plified by his comments on the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York and the National Catholic Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington. He says (p. 38):

These two, the one Protestant and the other Catholic, are anachronistic before they are finished. The Catholic shrine, indeed, is only now moving off the drawing board. [Dedicated in 1959]. Plans drawn up 25—30 years ago are now being put into effect. This outmoded conception will be "completed" with a maze of Byzantine towers and Romanesque domes absolutely meaningless to the twentieth century. It is true that modifications are being made, but why take half measures? Why not start over? Why not make it a living expression, a building which will command respect?

St. John's in New York is in slightly different dilemma, though the essential albatross is the same bird: a sentimental and expensive dedication to the dear, dead days of long ago. Despairing of ever raising enough money to finish the Cathedral in the fifteenth century style to which they'd hoped to become accustomed, the authorities are casting about for ways to solve the insolvable. St. Bernard's line in a letter to Abbot William of St. Thierry on the subject of over-ornamentation in churches is relevant: "For God's sake, if men are not ashamed of these follies, why at least do they not shrink from the expense?"

The reverse of this precise point, however, is one that is most troublesome about much of the promotion of contemporary architecture. The argument quite prominently advanced is that economy of construction demands a contemporary approach. Or "since it is necessary for us to have seating space for 600, obviously

we can only choose . . ." In very few of the comments in these three books can one find the proper premise for church construction—God. Much of the construction tends to begin with the pew or the "ancillary accommodation," even though the importance of the chancel is stressed for architectural effect. "The building should be shaped by worship and not worship by architecture. But for some time Protestants have been erecting buildings designed to achieve a 'mood' in which an individual might have a 'worship experience' rather than a setting for the activity of the church in showing its Lord in worship before the world" ("On Getting Good Architecture for the Church" by Marvin Halverson in *Religious Buildings for Today*, p. 4). Here at least God is given a place on the building committee's agenda. Something of the nature of God Himself, some expression of our evaluation of His greatness and goodness and love should be involved in the consideration of the type of building which we construct for Him. Something of the value we put on His redemptive activity toward us should be involved in the budget which we set for the construction of a building to do Him honor.

Ralph Adams Cram still deserves to be quoted at length, even though he deals with problems of a "contemporary" architecture of another generation, an architecture less worthy than that of our day.

What then are the qualities of a church, and their order of precedence? It seems to me that they are four, and that they stand in the following order of importance:

First of all, a church is a house of God, a place of His earthly habitation, wrought in the fashion of heavenly things, a visible type of heaven itself. From the day when God gave to Solomon the plan and the

fashion of the temple down to those wherein our own forefathers lavished their scanty wealth and toiled with devout hands to raise the awful fabrics of the mediaeval cathedrals and abbeys, this thought has lain as the cornerstone of every one of the great and splendid churches that brighten Christendom with the memory of devout and reverent times. They were building a house of God, and the treasure and labor lavished so abundantly were consecrated as they might never be on any other structure. All the wonders of art,—the handmaid of religion,—all the treasures gathered from many lands, were lavished here in gratitude and praise and thanksgiving; and nothing was too precious, indeed, all things failed in a measure, to show the deep devotion of faithful men, and their solemn knowledge of the majesty of that Presence that should enter and dwell therein.

There is scant kinship between this spirit and that which prompts and governs the construction of contemporary churches. Were it restored, if only in a small measure, men would understand more clearly the fatal error of the modern principle, realize that no tricks, no imitations, no cheapnesses, no pretences of any kind, are tolerable in a Christian Church, and that the admission of those things in the temple of the living God is blasphemy. Instead of the cheap and tawdry structures of shingles and clapboards, or flimsy brick and stone veneering, doomed to very desirable decay, we should have once more solid and enduring temples that, even if by reason of our artistic backwardness could not at first compare with the noble work of the Middle Age, would at least take place with it in point of honor instead of standing, as now, a perpetual reminder of our meanness and our hypocrisy.

This is the first and highest reason for church building, and the second is this: the providing of a place apart where may

be solemnized the sublime mysteries of the Catholic faith; a temple reared about the altar and subordinate to it, leading up to it, as to the center of honor, growing richer and more splendid as it approaches the sanctuary, where is concentrated all the wealth of obedient and loving workmanship that may be obtained by means of personal sacrifice through years that gather into centuries. . . . It is unnecessary to argue for the importance of this exalted quality in church building. Conscience, instinct, impulse, all urge us to glorify, with the extreme of our power, the sanctuary of the Lord. It seems incredible that in the last few centuries this, the eminent reason and law of church building, should have been so grievously obscured, until men should wrongheadedly have reared their auditoriums and show structures, forgetting the supremacy of the sacramental nature of the Church in the zeal for the glorification of her prophetic nature. Such has, however, been the case; but thanks to recent events, it is no longer necessary to argue for a more just conception of things.

The third aspect of church architecture is this: the creation of spiritual emotion through the ministry of all possible beauty of environment; the using of art to lift men's minds from secular things to spiritual, that their souls may be brought into harmony with God. The agency of art to this end is immeasurable, and until the time of the Reformers this fact was always recognized. Not in the barren and ugly meeting-house of the Puritans, with its whitewashed walls, three-decker pulpit and box pews, were men most easily lifted out of themselves into spiritual communion with God,—nor there did they come most clearly to know the charity and sweetness of Christianity and the exalting solemnity of divine worship, but where they were surrounded by the dim shadows of mysterious aisles, where lofty piers of stone

soft
arch
light
down
sain
eve
man
ima
of
dead
alw
stil

the
clu
por
the
cor
the
I
qua
a
be
a p
[C

Ex
Mr. E
I
ma
are
be
ch
in
sp
Ti
sy
co
by
hi
ri
ar
I
da

softened high overhead into sweeping arches and shadowy vaults, where golden light struck down through storied windows, painted with the benignant faces of saints and angels; where the eye rested at every turn on a painted and carven Bible, manifesting itself through the sense to the imagination; where every wall, every foot of floor, bore its silent memorial to the dead, its thank-offering to God; where was always the faint odor of old incense, the still atmosphere of prayer and praise. . . .

The fourth aspect of church building is the one which is generally considered exclusively, and is precisely the last in importance of the four that I have named,—the arrangement of a building where a congregation may conveniently listen to the instruction of its spiritual leaders. I do not mean for an instant that this quality must be sacrificed to the others: a church, if it is properly designed, may be a perfect sanctuary, a perfect temple, a perfect auditorium. . . .

[*Church Building*. By Ralph Adams Cram.
Boston: Marshall Jones Co., 1924,
pp. 6—10]

Expressing a similar understanding is Mr. Halverson's later paragraph (p. 6):

I believe that the transcendence and immanence of God can be expressed in church architecture today perhaps better than ever before. The concern of contemporary architects with space and the relationship in inter-penetration of interior and exterior space can be highly significant. Professor Tillich asserts that space is our most valid symbol of God. The God who cannot be contained or "spatialized" is represented by definition of space which covers man in his finitude. With today's building materials and techniques it is possible to achieve architectural space of symbolic power. I believe that the Church building of our day can best express God's transcendence

of space and time as it also expresses the immanence of God in employing the space and time possibilities of modern architecture.

Obviously cost factors and budget attitudes are only symptoms—construction of a modern character can be just as expensive as a Gothic building, depending upon the details of the construction. Just as obviously no one can set a total amount that would express the value of Almighty God to every parish. The tremendous pressures of suburban growth and the rapid changes in urban development make necessary a rethinking of older judgments. But what is of concern is the matter of motivation. Even the right solution would be treason if the right thing is being done for the wrong reason.

But once again—look at the pictures. They carry facts which the words do not express. In the volume in which Mr. Spaeth protests the continuation of cathedral building in Washington and New York, the pictures make clear that the albatross he shoots is one of style and not of concept. The "contemporary expression of Cathedral traditions" by Basil Spence is given, describing his reasoning in the development of a new design for Coventry Cathedral. The photographs of that design as well as picture after picture of other construction give evidence that the motivation for most of the contemporary architecture pictured is not simply one of economy but one of expressing the Christian's free and living relationship with God through Jesus Christ.

One final note. Are there any churches which in their chancel architecture are really coming to grips with the sacramental revival of the liturgical movement? If the blessing of the reception of the body and

blood of our Lord is recognized, if the Eucharistic service is regarded as a full expression of the Christian church's worship, are architects arranging Communion rails and chancel areas to make possible the communing of a total parish? It is obvious that architects are paying attention to the needs of the flesh by a careful counting of pew seatings. Are they making as adequate a provision for the spirit by the number of kneeling spaces provided at the Communion rails? and as sympathetic a consideration for the flesh that protests a service extended unreasonably by the time required to commune a large congregation in groups of 12 and instead provides adequate space for the movement of an entire congregation to the altar? These three volumes would give evidence that the answer is no. The Communion rail in many Lutheran churches continues to be only the width of a chancel which is narrower than the nave and has doors only for the minister. In some instances the rail is as wide as the nave. In such instances the block may be in the parish's insistence on a traditional traffic pattern that is inefficient. But where is the evidence of a construction approach that recognizes the objective of involving the entire parish family in the reception of the sacrament, a participation that would both express the unity of the body of Christ gathered in worship and the blessings which the sacrament gives to each believer? Dr. Joseph Sittler, in *Religious Buildings for Today*, asserts:

The Lutheran Tradition is Christocentric through and through. God is the God who is revealed in Christ. The knowledge of God is what is offered in Christ. The worship of God centers in the entire Christ-deed, from birth through death and

resurrection, to His real presence in the household of God.

Therefore every effort to give this tradition palpable, declaratory force must set forth, point to, hold up, and draw to the single Christ-center, the multitudinous details of worship. . . .

The sole, final, and absolutely redemptive fact is God's deed in Christ: Christ in His historical actuality as Jesus of Nazareth, in His real presence . . . received and adored in His Church.

The editor adds to this statement that this places "the burden of the formal expression of meaning squarely on the architect. . . ."

The architects represented in these volumes have continued to value the Lutheran accent on the altar as the focus of worship. They have continued to express the parish's approach to God by placing the Communion rail in the chancel. But none of those represented here seems to have attempted to solve the matter of the number of communicants who can be served in the duration of an average worship service. True, none of the Lutheran churches that have constructed their worship around a central altar are represented in these volumes. But though the central altar would express the involvement of the total congregation in the Communion action, how many of those attempt to make possible a total communing by a large parish in a single service, and a communing in that service week after week? Since the actuality of Christ and His real presence in the church are part of the heart of our belief, and since the reception as well as the adoration and the hearing of our Lord are central to the Lutheran tradition, architects' plans should enable the total parish to participate in the total worship of our Lord.

St. Louis, Mo.

THI
W
whor
moth
shape
moth
ing,
child
in hi
a litt
chang
the I
dren
ing t

J.
I. TA
A.
B.
on o
C.
need
they
are s
can't
love,

II. T
b
A.
buke
Jesus

B.
or a
they
etc.
C.
His

Outlines on the Synodical Conference Gospels, Second Series

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

MARK 10:13-16

What is a child? The answer depends on whom you ask and when. An expectant mother is apt to say that a child is bulgy shapelessness and a backache. A harried mother in midday will say a child is a vexing, mischievous, dirty rascal. When this child is washed, in his sleepers, and sleeping in his little bed, mother will say, "Isn't he a little angel?" God, whose opinion does not change, says, "Children are an heritage of the Lord." A good stewardship of the children on loan to us will include remembering that

Jesus Wants to Bless Our Children

I. *They need the Lord's blessing*

A. Jesus thought so (v. 14).

B. Scripture says so. Choice of passages on original sin.

C. Experience agrees thereto. Children need not be taught vices. It is the graces that they need to learn. For example, children are selfish by nature — "that's mine," "he can't have that," etc. Sharing, an evidence of love, must be taught.

II. *They are capable of receiving the Lord's blessing*

A. We don't know why the disciples rebuked those that brought the children — Jesus too busy? Children not important?

B. Human reason still objects in one way or another: Children cannot believe because they can't understand, sleep during Baptism, etc.

C. But Jesus made them the objects of His benediction (v. 16). In fact, the recep-

tiveness which marks a child is requisite for kingdom membership. (V. 15)

III. *Therefore bring your children to Jesus*

A. Show the sort of concern for your children's spiritual welfare which reflects the "they brought" of v. 13. We devote thought, energy, money, to children's teeth, health, music, education. Good! But "what shall it profit," etc.?

B. Jesus will bless them. First Baptism (appropriate passages); then build on this foundation with the Word at home via Bible stories, family devotions. Regularly in church so that babies learn the habit. Sunday school, confirmation classes, VBS. Every association with the Word is an opportunity for Jesus to take your children up in His arms and to bless them.

Today's Gospel — a man finds a lost sheep, a woman her lost coin. Their joy illustrates the joy in heaven over a recovered sinner. If an angelic choir chants this paean of praise, there must be an antiphonal chorus which answers with a "Hallelujah" when a little one is brought to Jesus.

Quincy, Ill.

E. J. OTTO

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

LUKE 17:1-10

(Our text is a discourse composed of logia which appear in slightly different forms and sometimes different contexts in Matthew and Mark. Furthermore, it seems to be a discourse which finds its unity in the persons addressed, i. e., the disciples, rather than in its subject matter. At least three different topics are treated: 1-4, the Disciple in the Community; 5-6, the Disciple's Faith; 7-10, the Disciple's Reward, a paragraph peculiar to Luke. In order to preserve the unity of the sermon, we shall not

attempt to integrate these different sayings into one sermon. Instead we shall treat the first group of sayings as the text. This departs a bit from the emphasis of the old Gospel for the day but accords well with the Collect and the standard Old Testament pericope, for the church is to be the community on which the holy God has put His name.)

Somebody has said that the church is not a gathering of perfected saints but of a group of sinners trying to be saints. Rightly understood this is so. Often those outside the church fail to see this. But this "trying to be saints" is not something which is done on an individual basis alone. The church is a community, called to holiness, in which each is supposed to help the other achieve the goal which the holy God has set for His people. Our text is a reminder from our Lord of the responsibilities each of us has as His disciple within the community of believers.

The Disciple in the Community of Believers

I. *The true disciple of Jesus Christ seeks to preserve the holiness of the church, the community of believers*

A. By taking heed unto himself.

1. A Christian believer knows that he has been called to holiness (1 Thess. 4:3). Holiness of life, which is the life of love in the Spirit of God, is the outward sign of the inner possession of salvation. The whole redeemed community is called to holiness. (Explanation to Third Article)

2. Sin destroys the life of God in the individual and in the community. Thus sin endangers the most precious possession we have — our eternal salvation. The Savior would not have warned us against sin so earnestly if it were not so terribly serious (vv. 1 and 2).

3. The true disciple of Jesus Christ will be careful to avoid causing the brother to sin. Given a fallen world, it is impossible that temptations to sin (RSV), σκάνδαλα,

do not come. The disciple will dedicate himself to the task of edifying the brother and never giving offense. A σκάνδαλον was a trap or snare. It became an expression for enticement or allurement to sin. We set no σκάνδαλα before the brother* (v. 3 a). Practical examples. The Christian lives with an eye to the brother at home, work, and play.

B. By taking heed unto others.

1. Sometimes the brother will err (v. 3 b). This also threatens the life of God in the fellowship of believers. It is a danger to the brother.

2. The Christian has a responsibility toward the brother. He must rebuke him (v. 3 b). He does this in order to win him, for once again the issue is eternal salvation. When the brother repents, he must always be forgiven. Thus the community of believers is built up in holiness and love and salvation preserved.

II. *The Disciple becomes mindful of his need for repentance*

A. No one can study this text without being led to searching self-examination. We see that we have lived within the fellowship of the church unmindful of the brother's needs ("After all, it's my business how I live") and of our responsibility toward him ("I'll just write him off and let it go at that.") We have given in to the individualistic attitude which besets the modern church. This causes us sadness.

B. With grateful hearts we remember Jesus' words "If he repents, forgive him."

* Most commentators see in "little ones" a reference to immature Christians (Arndt) or children. Stählin (*Skandalon*, 1930) sees it as a reference to any Christian. The Savior seems to be saying: "Christian believers may look little and insignificant, but look at the punishment which follows if you lead any one of them into sin." This is a powerful interpretation against an insensitive disregard of the brother.

These
ness.
sake
was
gave
be co-

C.
of ho-
power
spons-
presen-

Our
Chris-
its co-
will b-
who
us all

Yo

FIFT

(T
ever,
reward
Sever
tion:
"Love
here
or do
life a
and i
old c
word
for
τούς
sheep
inspi
parti
only
stitu
or is
less
claim
Peter
the c
sheep
expres

These words are a mirror of divine forgiveness. God forgives those who repent for the sake of Jesus Christ. He more than any other was mindful of others to the extent that he gave His life that all our σκάνδαλα might be covered and forgiven.

C. We accept that forgiveness today, aware of how little we deserve it, letting it be a power within us for a deeper and more responsible life of sanctification. Thus God preserves us in His gift of salvation and uses us to preserve our brethren also.

Our Epistle for this day points us to the Christian hope. What a joy it will be to see its consummation! And what added joy it will be if, when we see it, there is one there who will say, "You helped me!" God grant us all to experience that joy.

Yonkers, N. Y. RICHARD E. KOENIG

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

JOHN 21:15-19

(This is a beloved and familiar text. However, careful study of the original Greek will be rewarding even to the most experienced pastor. Several points of interpretation deserve attention: (1) Our Lord's question to Peter [v. 15]: "Lovest thou Me more than these?" Does Christ here refer to the other disciples [Matt. 26:33], or does He merely refer to Peter's old familiar life and love of fishing, in view of his hasty and impulsive earlier action? [Vv. 6, 7] (2) The old question of the significance of different words used here: for love, ἀγαπάω and φιλῶ; for Peter's work, feed, βόσκειν, and tend, τομαΐνειν; for the people, ἄνθρωποι, lambs, and sheep, προβάτια. Obviously, our Lord and the inspired evangelist had some reason for this particular and varied use of words, even if it is only for euphony. (3) Do vv. 18 and 19 constitute a direct prophecy of Peter's martyrdom, or is it merely a general picture of the helplessness of old age? (4) The Roman Catholic claim that this text is important evidence for Peter's primacy in view of the questions and the charge directed to him, "Feed My lambs . . . sheep." The basic thought of the text is well expressed in the Collect and ties in well with

both Epistle and Gospel. The outline here presented makes a general application of Christ's words to St. Peter.)

Love is really the key word for understanding the Bible. God's redeeming love in Jesus Christ is the golden thread throughout all Scripture — promised in the Old Testament times, fulfilled in the New. All Christians profess faith in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. We trust in God's love and forgiveness. We are also to show this love in our lives. If faith in God's love and mercy is genuine it always manifests itself in thought, words, and action. "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." Do we really do so?

The Proof of Love

I. *We prove love to Christ by our words*
(15-17)

A. This was one of the last conversations which Christ had with His disciples. It took place when Christ had revealed Himself to them on the Sea of Galilee, after a breakfast together. He gave them another dramatic proof of His resurrection, His presence, the reality of His glorified body.

B. Three questions directed to Simon Peter. The first time Christ asked, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these?" The second and third time He simply asked "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?" The thrice-repeated question undoubtedly was a reminder of Peter's three-fold denial. (Matt. 26:69-75)

C. Earlier, Peter had suddenly and impulsively jumped out of the boat in order to swim toward Christ on the shore (v. 7). Christ's question made him face up to the real situation: Would love for Him prove to be stronger than concern for the old life, fishing, earthly things?

D. Three times Peter, in clear and unmistakable words, professed love for Christ. The third time Peter even appeals to Christ's

omniscience. Here are words of honest confession! Peter no longer claims to be more faithful than others. He merely says that he loves Christ!

E. The words of our mouth are necessary. They can reveal our inmost thoughts and emotions. God Himself places a high value on speech (Rom. 10:10). What does your speech reveal or accomplish? Above all, what do your words reveal about faith and love in Christ? Yet words are not the only proof of love.

II. We prove love to Christ by our deeds (15-17)

A. Christ assigned a task to Peter upon each affirmation of his love for Him. The first time He said: "Feed My lambs" (little ones). Then the Lord said twice : "Feed My sheep" (older members of the flock). Lambs need more constant care than sheep, but both types need faithful pastoral instruction, guidance, and protection. Peter was again declared to be an apostle and leader among God's people.

B. Peter's confession of love, in words, was good and necessary. It was not sufficient, however. The apostle was enjoined to show the reality of his faith and love in his life and deeds. Peter's principal work upon earth was to feed Christ's children and people. A true pastor must bring spiritual food in the means of grace. He is also to shepherd and guide his people. (1 Peter 5:2; Acts 20:28)

C. Deeds are always the proof of Christian faith and love. 1 John 3:18: "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." 1 John 4:11: "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." 1 John 4:20: "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

D. Every Christian professes faith and love for Christ. Not every professed Christian, however, shows by his deeds that he is a true disciple. "They profess that they know God, but in works they deny Him, being abominable and disobedient and unto every good work reprobate." (Titus 1:16)

E. What does an honest evaluation of your own life and deeds show? Home and family life. Business and social contacts. Church and community work. Remember the words which Christ will speak on Judgment Day! (Matt. 25:40, 45)

III. We prove love to Christ by our faithfulness unto the end (18-19)

A. The final test of Peter's love would come in later years. Then he would be alone, aged, helpless. His enemies would be able to do with him as they wished. Would he show his love for Christ and remain faithful even then?

B. The text clearly says that he would "glorify God" even in his death. There seems to be a reference to death by crucifixion in the Lord's words about those who would "stretch forth" his hands.

C. Ancient tradition speaks of Peter's martyrdom in Rome. Eusebius says (on Origen's authority) that Peter was crucified at Rome, head downwards, on his own request. The one who had denied his Lord three times on the night of His betrayal became strong enough to seal his confession of love with his very life and blood.

D. No one knows what the future will bring. In ancient times Christians were willing to die rather than deny Christ. There are places in the world today where Christians must be prepared to die for their faith. Christ is more precious than anything that this earth can bring or offer us. Would we be ready to die, if necessary, rather than deny Him? Those who truly love Him know that He is more precious than life itself! "Be

thou f
a cro

Pec
ward
may 1
Christ
Amer
in ou
have b
and p
legiti
"Is th
a thre
We p
by ou
the er

Ch

SIXT

(O
troit
the v
people
Psalm
Stand
demo
excep
Phari
source
plicat
creas

So
a do
As a
deep
the c
of th
Word
chang
stati
or "
"It
chan
that

thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." (Rev. 2:10)

People are beginning to see that the outward prosperity of the church in America may be very deceptive. Millions belong to Christian churches. Church membership in America has reached the highest percentage in our history. The numbers and the wealth have been increasing. People come to church and profess faith and love. It is fair and legitimate, however, when we are asked: "Is this genuine religion?" Our text gives a threefold test and proof of Christian love. We prove our love to Christ by our words, by our deeds, and by our faithfulness unto the end. May God enable us to do this.

Chicago, Ill.

JAMES G. MANZ

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

MATT. 15:1-9

(Observe the propers for the day. The Introit strikes the theme and spirit of the day in the words "The Lord is the Strength of His people." The Gradual reaches its climax in the Psalm "Deliver me in Thy righteousness." The Standard Gospel underscores this petition by demonstrating the need for a righteousness that exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, and the Standard Epistle reveals the source of it. The Collect, therefore, is the supplication of Christ's holy people for the "increase of true religion.")

Someone has said that it is easier to change a doctrine than it is to change a tradition. As a church grows old, her traditions become deeply ingrained. There is more concern that the church retain and observe "the tradition of the elders" than maintain the purity of Word and Sacrament. Resistance to any change in tradition is often expressed by statements such as "We tried that before," or "We have always done it this way," or "It isn't Lutheran." Resistance properly channeled must be resistance against a faith that degenerates into a rule-book religion

of tradition, ceremony, custom. Today we note

The Ruin of Rule-Book Religion

I. Rule-book religion ruins the true Christian faith

A. As devotees of rule-book religion this was the intent of the scribes and Pharisees. Their concern for the rules prompted a special delegation from Jerusalem (v. 1). The tradition of the elders required washing before eating, for hands that might have touched anything belonging to a Gentile would defile the food, and the food, in turn, would defile the eater. The disciples violated this "canon law" of the church. The scribes and Pharisees held Jesus responsible, for what they did as His disciples must have been done by His consent and, perhaps, by His example. The charge reflects how closely they were watched, how exemplary their conduct, since no more serious charge could be found. It also shows what importance rule-book religion attaches to the rules. We may observe the same in rule-book religion today.

B. Rule-book religion destroys the concept of true righteousness. Pharisaic righteousness consisted in merit self-attained through ceremony and tradition. True righteousness is beyond human attainment, something infinitely better. See Matt. 5:20, the Standard Gospel for the day. The Pharisees were, indeed, good people, but their rule-book righteousness was a deceiving mask. The righteousness of Christ is a saving robe.

C. Rule-book religion destroys the exercise of true righteousness (vv. 3-6). While the Pharisees insisted on hand washing, a tradition of the elders, they violated the law of love and mercy, the laws of God. Jesus replied with a countercharge. Their traditions permitted a man to ignore his obligation to support his parents by the claim that his money was being given to the church. While their rule-book religion, therefore, claimed faithfulness to tradition, it neglected

love. The priest and Levite "passed by on the other side," reading their rule books.

D. Rule-book religion fosters hypocrisy. See vv. 7, 8. It would, in fact, make God Himself guilty of hypocrisy by the assertion that a perfect God could accept an imperfect holiness in man. It makes a hypocrite of its devotee inasmuch as hand washing is confused with heart washing. Clean hands, but an impure heart. The mote and the beam. Rule-book religion has no confession of sin, no forgiveness for sin, no cross, no Christ.

E. Rule-book religion is a vain religion (v. 9). It is vain worship. It would come into the divine Presence in something less than the righteousness of Christ, without a wedding garment, as whitened sepulchres, behind a false front. The worship of the good Pharisee contrasted with the worship of the scoundrel publican.

F. The extent of rule-book religion today. It is greater than we should like to think. It is the religion of natural man, manifested in every heathen creed. It often assumes a Christian flavor in pietism, formalism, church tradition, legalism, bootstrap Christianity. It may ensnare us too. Not that we would assert salvation by works, for we know better than that; we know all the catechism's answers. But we can so easily turn our churchgoing, our Communion celebrations, our offerings, into a rule-book system.

II. *The Christian faith is the ruin of rule-book religion*

A. It reveals the emptiness in the cup of human righteousness. It describes the terrible gulf that is fixed between man's holiness and God's holiness and the failure of everything human to bridge that gulf. It offers no comfort in the greater delinquency of others. It tears off the mask and reveals our spiritual nakedness.

B. But the Christian Gospel offers hope. It calls for a new heart (v. 8; Ps. 24:3, 4;

Ezek. 36:26; John 3). The vessels in which the sediments of sin have settled must be cleansed on the inside. Not the sprinkling of perfume on the surface of the heart's cesspool, but a new heart, a pure heart. The blood cleanses. The atoning sacrifice. 2 Cor. 5:21 and Rom. 5:19. "In Thy righteousness"—here is our deliverance. Salvation is not a seniority or priority that is built up over years of "obedience." It is a gift. God is no credit bureau, no scorekeeper. His Gospel confers the new heart it requires, for

C. The Christian Gospel offers not only cleansing from past sin but also cleanliness. It creates a clean heart and renews a right spirit. Rules? Rules, indeed! The rule of Christ and the rule of His Spirit in the heart.

III. *Increase in us true religion*

A. The means? The Gospel, as above. And the Gospel in Baptism (Rom. 6, today's Epistle). Buried with Christ, dead to sin; raised with Christ, alive to God.

B. And the results? Newness of life. Purity of heart. Rich in good works. True religion. (James 1:27)

C. Our prayer: "Increase in us true religion." The religion that knows Christ, the righteous Savior; that is filled with the Holy Ghost, His purifying Spirit (Ps. 51:7). And the pure in heart shall see God.

St. Louis, Mo.

A. F. WEDEL

THE SEVENTH SUNDAY

AFTER TRINITY

MATT. 15:10-20

The introduction could well be the development of v. 8, because it indicates what is the ongoing problem of the Christian and calls for the ongoing work of God.

God's New Creation

The theme and the heart of the text must be v. 13. Here we find what we must always

look for
this ver

I. It i

A.
it (v.
still to
the na
self in
demar

B.
(v. 11
the v
made
readil
tempt
promi
from
main
ing an
heart
things

II. It

A.
(v. 10
that t
sible
call t
merel
hear
merel
also c
under

B.
even
15, 1
the s
also
Chris
Peter
unde
willin
it mi

which
ust be
nking
s cess-
The
2 Cor.
teous-
ion is
ilt up
God
s Gos-
for
only
liness.
right
le of
n the

above.
today's
o sin;
Pu-
re reli-
reli-
, the
Holy
And

EL

0-20
evel-
at is
and

must
ways

look for, both Law and Gospel, and under this verse the rest comes out right.

I. It is always opposed

A. All Pharisaism is always offended by it (v. 12), especially the Pharisaism that is still to be found in ourselves. This is still the natural man who goes to work on himself in order to produce what God's Law demands.

B. It always has to do with externals only (v. 11). This is not only legalism, but also the very heart of all man-made religion, made still and also by ourselves. We can readily spot it by the manner we are always tempted to still our accusing consciences: by promises and efforts at improvement apart from grace. It should be noted that our main emphasis is not in the direction of fasting and ceremonies but of the attitude, the heart (vv. 13 and 19), out of which these things proceed.

II. It calls for renewal of our understanding

A. This is the initial breakthrough of God (v. 10). When Jesus urges men to hear so that they understand, He also make it possible for them to understand. This is the call to initial repentance, so that we do not merely hear with our ears but that what we hear penetrates to the condemnation not merely of our ordinary kind of hearing but also of our way of looking at things, our understanding.

B. This is necessary as long as we live, even for us who already follow Christ (vv. 15, 16). Peter, disciple that he was, needed the same kind of hearing, because he was also without understanding. This is the Christian living the life of repentance. Like Peter, however, it knows where to go for understanding — to Christ, and like Peter it willingly submits to His rebuke in order that it might be made to understand what Christ means and that He always means us.

III. It condemns us for what we are in ourselves

A. The condemnation is implicit in the fact that God must create new and cannot simply take what He finds in us (v. 13). The condemnation is openly stated in the fact that God must pull us up as plants which He has not planted. It is the work of God's Law, the ongoing work of His Law, lest we pride ourselves in our expressions, our advances over what we once were, and fail to see that the condemnation always hovers over everything that is not altogether and only under grace.

B. The condemnation is radical (v. 13) in that the plant itself must be pulled up by God if He has not planted it. This is why mere religious tinkering is never enough, because there is still the heart of the man (v. 19), and until the heart itself is reached, it will continue to bear its own fruit and not the fruit of God's plant.

C. We always express what we are before God so that we ourselves are condemned as evil. Here we emphasize again that we sin because we are sinners and do not become sinners by individual acts of sin. Here the true Lutheran doctrine with regard to original sin needs to be preached in the light of vv. 13 and 19 so that we do not end up with our own refined kind of moralism or something less than the confession of sin, which admits that "I am by nature sinful and unclean." I am in this horrible condition of rebellion against God, and that's why all my actions are the actions of a rebel against Him, even my rites and ceremonies and deeds by which I would worship and serve God.

IV. God makes new what submits to His condemnation

A. The promise is already implicit in the endearing term used with regard to God as we are reminded that the real Worker here

is the heavenly Father of this Jesus Christ (v. 13). When we come to see Him as such, our eyes are opened from their blindness in which we reckoned religiously only by ourselves and are brought to see how God makes all things new.

B. Under the crushing of God's condemnation, or the pulling out of that which God did not plant, we not merely recognize our own inadequacy in the things of God, but we have wrung from us the cry of repentance "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" This is the first look away from ourselves so that we listen to this Jesus who is working us over so unmercifully that we may yet cry for mercy. This will never happen so long as we have a leg of our own to stand on, so long as we are even only remotely sufficient of ourselves to still think something of ourselves.

C. God's new creation is faith itself, faith whereby the heart becomes new and produces no longer of its own but of God. St. Paul reminds us that whatever is not of faith is

sin. By the same token, what is of faith, is pleasing to God. Faith makes us new so that we now produce in faith what is the product of God: these are the good works of the life that is in Christ. Believing in this Jesus who is here talking to us and with His address offering to make us new plants planted of His heavenly Father, God also becomes our heavenly Father and not merely the God who must be appeased and whose negative reckoning must be offset by our positive efforts. This is the Gospel.

D. As God's new creation we please God. We are God's children, and He loves what we do, not because it is so good in itself but because it is the doing of people whom He loves, it is the doing of His beloved children. Now many things still proceed out of hearts that are not everything that they should be by exact legal definition, but God takes them because they come out of hearts over which He is the heavenly Father in Christ Jesus.

WILLIAM A. BUEGE
Minneapolis, Minn.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

PAUL M. BRETSCHER, professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

RICHARD BAEPLER, member of Department of Religion, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.

HERBERT J. A. BOUMAN, professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

GEORGE W. HOYER, professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

BRIE

P
in L
creas
denc
Wor
hear

T
Latin
New
figur
near
pasto
let a

D
nific
poi
ture
we

bo
fa
P
L

a
g
sy

co

L
a

P

b

n

n

o

b

s

i

a

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

BRIEF ITEMS

Porto Alegre, Brazil.—"Lutheran churches in Latin America are growing in stature, increasing in momentum," and exhibiting "evidence of maturity and mission," the Lutheran World Federation Executive Committee heard at its meeting here.

The director of the LWF Committee on Latin America, Dr. Stewart W. Herman of New York, said in his report that "statistical figures indicated a baptized membership of nearly 900,000—although the number of pastors is not keeping pace with the need, let alone the opportunities, which face us."

Dr. Herman also listed a number of "significant developments (which) may be pointed out as the harbingers of new departures into very promising directions." They were:

- meetings of considerable consequence... between the various Lutheran theological faculties in South America, located at Jose C. Paz and Villa Ballester, Argentina, and at Sao Leopoldo and Porto Alegre, Brazil;

- the cultivation of . . . relations on a country-by-country basis among Lutheran groups until now kept apart by divergent synodical traditions or national origins;

- the discerning management of, and contribution to, revolving loan funds which Lutheran churches of various countries make available to groups in Latin America for such purposes as buying church sites and erecting buildings on them;

- greater participation in specific ecumenical projects;

- the waxing readiness to join forces in mission work;

- the renewed attention to the production of Lutheran literature, currently highlighted by the completion of a new hymnal and service book and a pastor's service book, both in Spanish, and by plans to begin work on a \$60,000 edition of Luther's works in the same language; and

— recent efforts to work toward a broad social service program.

Dr. Herman said the Latin American committee was "heartily grateful for the fact that the meeting to which this account is submitted is occurring on Latin American soil."

Latin America, he added, "may thus be seen to contain an increasingly important part of the worldwide Church of the Reformation."

This was the first time in LWF history that its Executive Committee met in the Western Hemisphere, outside the United States. Numerous leaders of Latin American churches attended as invited observers.

The Latin America committee itself was scheduled to meet in Porto Alegre in the two days immediately following the Executive Committee sessions.

Porto Alegre, Brazil.—How the Lutheran World Federation's new "research professor" plans to begin his first task of providing Protestants with a fresh evaluation of modern Roman Catholic doctrine and practice was detailed here.

In its report to the meeting of the LWF Executive Committee, the federation's Special Commission on Interconfessional Research included a statement of what Prof. K. E. Skydsgaard, on leave from the University of Copenhagen, will be doing under its guidance during the next few years.

Text of the statement follows:

During the coming years Professor Skydsgaard will concentrate his study primarily on Roman Catholicism as it appears in contemporary theology and church life. He will plan to publish a book outlining contemporary Roman Catholicism which would be a study of the controversial problems which are especially discussed in the theology of the Reformation.

Within this framework Professor Skydsgaard will use some time for studying the

problem of Scripture and tradition, especially in view of recent developments in Mariology and other problems. Since he is also the chairman of the Commission on Tradition and Traditions in the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches, Professor Skydsgaard's contribution will at this point also be of specific importance for ecumenical work.

Since Roman Catholicism is a complexity of theological and practical problems, it should also be studied at the very places where Roman Catholic piety has its expressions. Therefore Professor Skydsgaard plans to travel to important Roman Catholic centers, which will include a visit to Rome. He will enlarge his experience through personal contacts and will also give some specific consideration to the Pope's plans to call an "ecumenical" council.

The commission has also given special attention to the problems which arise on the mission field where Roman Catholicism is using a method which very often irritates the non-Roman churches. It has been the commission's hope that Professor Skydsgaard may even have the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the problems here involved through co-operation with the Commission on World Mission.

Next summer Professor Skydsgaard is planning to hold a small seminar mainly for graduate students from Scandinavian countries in order to study the important decisions of the Tridentine (Trent) Council. During the follow-up he hopes to continue such seminars on a broader international level. It was felt of primary interest that Professor Skydsgaard's abilities should be used for the instruction of younger theologians who could then contribute to this important work.

It is Professor Skydsgaard's intention to develop a library which would include standard works on Roman Catholicism, especially the encyclopedias, historical and dogmatical studies describing Roman Catholicism. This library will at present be located in the Ecumenical Institute of the University of Copenhagen, of which Professor Skydsgaard is the director. The library will be kept as

a separate unit until the final decision is made as to the location of the planned foundation.

The foundation referred to is an independent unit planned to be the ultimate vehicle for the Lutheran program of inter-confessional research. This foundation cannot be established until authorization is obtained at the federation's 1963 assembly in Helsinki.

Meanwhile the special commission, with official sanction, not only has launched the research program but also is preparing a draft constitution for the foundation itself. It informed the Executive Committee that the document would be ready for presentation at the latter's 1961 meeting.

To support Professor Skydsgaard and his research assistant in their prefoundation activities and to cover the cost of travel for its own meetings, the commission said it would need \$25,000 a year from LWF member churches and national committees.

Toward the budget for the program's first year, which began on Feb. 1, it reported that \$16,040 had been granted to it by the American, German, and Swedish national committees and the 6,000-member Lutheran Church in Italy.

In presenting the commission's report its secretary, Director Vilmos Vajta of the LWF Department of Theology, declared that "the support of the member churches and of the Executive Committee itself for this activity is of primary importance for the life of the Lutheran churches throughout the world."

His plea for support was reinforced by the commission's chairman, Bishop Herman Dietzelbinger of Munich, who is head of the Lutheran Church in Bavaria and an Executive Committee member.

Porto Alegre, Brazil.—Prominent theological scholars representing a wide range of confessional and personal positions on the 16th century Protestant Reformation will gather next August for an international re-

search
Wor
here.

Pr
the
Direc
Theo
to "2
atten

D
ing
searc
ical
gress
Gerr
the s
Rese
hus,

H
part
tinu
in i
conne
"loo
"fre

I
with
thos
Lut
Vajt

S
pec
ter
Man
the
sin

"
secu
Lut
pap

Tap
Phi
the
Pau

search congress convened by the Lutheran World Federation, an LWF official disclosed here.

Presenting his report at the meeting of the federation's Executive Committee here, Director Vilmos Vajta of the Department of Theology said invitations have been extended to "all those who have been brought to the attention (of the conveners)."

Dr. Vajta said he expected that "all leading personalities in the field of Luther research," representing "all shades of theological opinion," would participate in the congress, which is to take place at Münster, Germany, from Aug. 8 to 13. This will be the second International Congress for Luther Research, the first having been held in Aarhus, Denmark, in 1956.

He explained that although the LWF Department of Theology joined with a continuation committee of the Aarhus congress in issuing the invitations, the federation's connection with the Münster gathering is "loose" and involves no effort to control "freedom of research."

It will be "a research congress for experts with free participation on the part of all those who are connected with research in Luther's theology or the Reformation," Dr. Vajta stressed.

Some 100 outstanding scholars are expected to attend. Their discussions will center in the relations between the Reformer Martin Luther and his leading collaborator, the German humanist Philip Melanchthon, since this year marks the 400th anniversary of the latter's death.

"We have succeeded," Dr. Vajta said, "in securing the co-operation of such top-ranking Luther scholars as the following" to read papers at the congress:

From the United States, Dr. Theodore G. Tappert, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; Dr. Warren A. Quanbeck, Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.; Dr. Wilhelm Pauck, Union Theological Seminary, New

York; Dr. Harold Grimm, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

From Sweden, Prof. Herbert Olsson, University of Uppsala; the Rev. Peter Fraenkel of Lund.

From Germany, Dean Robert Stupperich, University of Münster; Prof. Rudolf Hermann, Humboldt University, Berlin; Dr. Oscar Thulin, director of the Luther Hall, Wittenberg; Prof. Bernhard Lohse, University of Hamburg.

From eastern Europe, Prof. D. Bartel of Warsaw, Poland, and Prof. Jenö Solyom of Budapest, Hungary.

Other countries expected to be represented among the conference participants include the United Kingdom, Australia, France, India, Japan, and Argentina. Director Stewart W. Herman of the LWF Committee on Latin America said the scholar from Argentina would be Prof. Carlos Witthaus of the Lutheran Theological Faculty in Jose C. Paz.

Other Americans expected to attend include Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.; Dr. Walter Kukkonen and Dr. R. H. Fischer, both of Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary; Dr. Fred W. Meuser, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio; Dr. E. Clifford Nelson, Luther Seminary, St. Paul; and Dr. Arnold E. Carlson, Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; Dr. E. G. Schwiebert, Executive Director of the Foundation for Reformation Research, and Dr. Carl S. Meyer, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

Porto Alegre, Brazil. — Three younger churches — two African and one Asian — were admitted into membership in the Lutheran World Federation by action of its Executive Committee.

Approved by the committee at its annual meeting here, March 20—25, were the 22,000-member Lutheran Church of Central Tanganyika, the 28,000-member Usambara-Digo Lutheran Church in the same country,

and the 4,500-member Taiwan Lutheran Church on the island of Formosa.

Their acceptance brings the federation's roll of affiliated churches to 64 in 34 countries, representing a combined membership of nearly 50 million of the estimated 71 million Lutherans in the world.

The LWF's Executive Committee deferred action on the membership application of the 113,000-member Evangelical Lutheran Ovambokavango Church of Southwest Africa pending further steps by that church body toward full autonomy. An outgrowth of work by the Finnish Missionary Society, the Ovambokavango Church was formally organized in 1954, and at its first assembly in 1958 it voted to seek membership in the LWF.

Also approved by the committee was an application for official LWF recognition from a Lutheran congregation in La Paz, Bolivia—the 600-member German-speaking Evangelical Lutheran church. It was the ninth congregation—all in South America—accorded such status, which is granted to local Lutheran churches in countries where there is no federation-affiliated church body, to enable them to have a fuller tie with world Lutheranism.

The Church of Central Tanganyika is the fruit of labor by missionaries from the Augustana Lutheran Church. The church was officially constituted in 1958, and the Augustana mission organization is now being integrated into it.

The Usambara-Digo Church—like the already LWF-affiliated Lutheran Church of Northern Tanganyika—is located on a mission field in that country originally developed by Germans but now administered under a federation trusteeship by the National Lutheran Council of the United States, with an international staff. Lutherans of other countries took over the work when conditions during and after World War II made

it impossible for the Germans to continue it.

All three African churches are currently headed by foreign missionaries: Ovambokavango by a Finn, the Rev. Alpo Hukka, Usambara-Digo by a German, the Rev. Heinrich Waltenberg of the Bethel Mission, and Central Tanganyika by an American, the Rev. Ruben A. Pedersen. All three, however, are free to choose an African, and one or two will probably do so within a few years.

President of the Taiwan Church is a national, the Rev. Peter Chou. This church was developed after the war by the Taiwan Lutheran Mission, a unified agency representing three North American and three Norwegian agencies as well as a Danish and a Finnish mission agency. Formal organization of the church took place in 1954.

Most of the Lutherans on Taiwan are Chinese who fled from the mainland when the Communists conquered the country. Present constituents of the united mission that was developed there in the early 1950s include the missionary groups from the Evangelical Lutheran, Augustana Lutheran, and Lutheran Free Churches of North America.

European mission agencies represented are that of the Norwegian Lutheran Free Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Mission, and the Norwegian, Danish, and Finnish missionary societies.

The La Paz congregation is the first Bolivian group to be recognized by the LWF. Of the congregations previously granted such status, four are in Venezuela, two in Colombia, and one each in Ecuador and Peru.

The La Paz congregation traces its origin to German Lutheran services started in the Bolivian capital in 1923, although it has had a full-time pastor and a parish council only since 1949. In the 1930s and '40s it was served by pastors from Argentina and Chile, who made periodical visits.

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

POPE JOHN XXIII: An Authoritative Biography. By Zsolt Aradi, James I. Tucek, and James C. O'Neill. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1959. x + 325 pages. Cloth. \$4.95.

POPE JOHN XXIII: His Life and Character. Paul C. Perrotta. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1959. Cloth. 276 pages. \$3.50.

The biography by Aradi, Tucek, and O'Neill is the fuller and more detailed personal history of these two books. Perrotta gives a sketch of the papacy, a description of the election, and the ceremony of the coronation. Aradi, Tucek, and O'Neill have written separate chapters in their book, of which especially the chapters by Aradi on Roncalli's 20 years in the Byzantine world and his diplomatic stint in Paris are important. The contacts with the churches in Bulgaria, Greece, and Athens have made John XXIII anxious for the union of the Orthodox churches with Rome. His action in calling an ecumenical council becomes understandable in the light of his previous experience. Both biographies have lists of former Roman bishops called John. The reading of either book or of both volumes will increase one's understanding of the church over which the 23d is called head. CARL S. MEYER

THE STORY OF THE REFORMATION. By William Stevenson. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1959. 206 pages. \$3.50.

This popular history of the Reformation for the general reader, written to stimulate interest in that movement, can be commended for its readability. By and large the author has presented a good overview of the first half of the 16th century. Minor inaccuracies

are found largely where he has used secondary authorities rather than primary sources; his account is best where his use of primary sources is most evident. He heaps too much blame on Luther in connection with the Peasants' War; too much praise, in general, on John Knox—but then the 400th anniversary of the Scottish Reformation provides the reason for this appraisal of the whole Reformation movement. CARL S. MEYER

THY WORD IS TRUTH: SOME THOUGHTS ON THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION. By Edward J. Young. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., c. 1955. Cloth. 287 pages. \$3.50.

INSPIRATION AND CANONICITY OF THE BIBLE: AN HISTORICAL AND EXEGETICAL STUDY. By R. Laird Harris. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, c. 1957. 304 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

These books by Fundamentalist seminary professors champion the verbal inspiration of the Bible against modern critical scholarship. Young, of Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia, is known for his work in Old Testament introduction. This is Harris' first published work. He is professor of the Old Testament at Covenant College and Seminary, near St. Louis. His work won first prize in Zondervan's Third Christian Textbook Contest.

Young's massive apologetic is written out of fear that "evangelicals" too are casting overboard the historic faith in inspiration. Although Harris' work appears to be less polemic in its orientation and is more scholarly in its documentation, Harris too

sees the issue of the day as a choice between supernaturalism and naturalism. Young differentiates, at least in the latter sections of his book, more carefully than does Harris between the neo-orthodox and the old-line liberal position, although for Young too every practitioner of critical methodology seems necessarily at loggerheads with an evangelical view of the Bible.

Young's classic argument for inerrancy holds for both books. "What has been spoken by God, who cannot lie, must be pure and true altogether. Every word which proceedeth [sic] from the mouth of the heavenly Father must in the very nature of the case be absolutely free from error. If this is not so, God Himself is not trustworthy." (P. 40)

Harris' book is concerned also with canonicity. In fact, he seems to be finding fault with fellow evangelicals for neglecting a crucial area. "To know what is inspired is as vital as to know the nature of inspiration" (p. 7). "One must accept all the Bible or have no certainty regarding any of it" (p. 9). According to Harris, the canon did not grow gradually and especially not in the threefold stages of the Old Testament critics. The human authors, prophets in the Old Testament and apostles in the New, guaranteed the writings. Accordingly, all the Old Testament books were written by prophets, and St. Luke is called an "irregular" author whose work is necessarily superintended by Paul. Harris' thesis seems to be that for a book to be inspired it must have been written by a prophet or apostle, and that if it was, God must have seen to its quick inclusion into the canon.

Although both books are useful in challenging apodictic assumptions and false conclusions which subvert the inspiration and authority of Scripture, one would like to challenge several rationalistic *a priori* in these books. One would like to speculate, for example, if Young's quarrel with Kant is not mostly philosophical rather than theological. But for a Lutheran the basic un-

easiness is simply this: Young's theistic presuppositions (that God is one and Scripture is His Word) and Harris' legalistic preoccupation with Christ the Teacher as the ground rule for canonicity have none of the Lutheran soteriological orientation to the Scriptures which the late Frederick E. Mayer spelled out so well in *Religious Bodies of America*. In the emphasis on the didactic rather than the dynamic character of Scripture a Lutheran cannot help noting that for these authors the Word of God is never the sacraments or absolution or even preaching but always and only the Bible.

In one point both authors become quite "liberal." Both Young and Harris (p. 169 and p. 31 respectively) argue that the six creative days of Genesis were not necessarily 24 hours long. But although Young elsewhere castigates modern theologians who deny verbal inspiration for trying to get along with modern thought (p. 59), here he insists that his view is strictly exegetical and is no attempt at harmonization with geology.

HENRY W. REIMANN

THE SELECT WRITINGS OF JONATHAN EDWARDS. Volume I. Edited with an account of his life by Iain H. Murray. Swengel, Pa.: The Banner of Truth Trust, n. d. 176 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

Five chapters, which contain a large part of Edward's memoirs, "A Narrative of Surprising Conversions," and three sermons are included in this volume. The Yale edition of the works of Edwards receives the nod over this edition.

CARL S. MEYER

MILTON AND THIS PENDANT WORLD.

By George Wesley Whiting. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1958. xvii + 264 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

Paradise Lost and *Samson Agonistes* have their religious themes. According to Whiting, Milton indeed justifies the ways of God to man. His drama about Samson is based,

Whit
tion o
he po
tion o
figure
ings,
a kno
Gene
of P
which
which
scien
of M
His v
the t
point
nonp

THE
SC
DE
GR
14
TH

the
schol

HI
of th
view
phas
first
eign
that
rede
into
of "I
the

T
a p
para
Chr
grai
13:

Whiting contends, on a Puritan interpretation of the Hebraic account. In his *Lycidas* he points up preaching as the essential function of the church. The poet uses images and figures which have deep theological meanings, which can be understood only out of a knowledge of the Christian tradition. The Geneva Bible, for instance, supplied the poet of Puritanism with symbols and concepts which he embodied in his poetry. A secularized society, skeptical and indifferent, in which orthodox religion has decayed and science has triumphed, still needs the poetry of Milton—so this Milton scholar claims. His viewpoint is restricted. His emphasis on the theological content of Milton's poetry points up a fruitful avenue, however, for nonprofessional interests.

CARL S. MEYER

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM: SCRIPTURE STUDIES IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD. By George Eldon Ladd. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 143 pages. Cloth. \$2.75.

The author of this book aims to channel to the lay reader some of the results of the scholarly research done in recent decades on the subject of the kingdom of God.

He succeeds admirably in removing some of the uncritical debris which has spoiled the view of this exciting Biblical teaching, emphasizing that the kingdom of God is not first of all a realm or a people but "sovereignty," "royal authority." It is not the church that initiates the Kingdom, but it is God's redemptive activity that brings the church into being. Hence it is unbiblical to speak of "building the Kingdom." We cannot build the Kingdom, we can only proclaim it.

This sound philological approach leads to a perceptive appraisal of some of Jesus' parables. Ladd correctly emphasizes the Christological element in the parables of the grain of mustard seed and the leaven (Matt. 13:31-33) and rejects the view that these

texts speak of the church's external and internal growth. That God should aim to effect His kingdom purposes in Jesus of Nazareth—this is the great mystery. The exposition, however, of the parable of the tares leaves something to be desired. Ladd emphasizes a contrast between the wicked and the good, whereas the text (Matt. 13:24-30) expressly suggests a problem due to the close similarity of the tares to the good grain. Here a study of the parable's *Sitz im Leben* would help in the interpretation.

The Sermon on the Mount is treated with grave moral concern, but the author regrettably fails to give expression to the soteriological orientation which the introductory beatitudes themselves offer. A literalistic view is taken of the millennium in Rev. 20, unconvincingly supported by 1 Cor. 15:20-28.

FREDERICK W. DANKER

CONFFLICT WITH DARKNESS. By H. Virginia Blakeslee. Westchester, Ill.: Good News Publishers, 1957. 64 pages. Paper. 50 cents.

This slender pamphlet gives one a taste of the fearful terror loosed by the Mau Mau among the Christians of the Kikuyu country in Kenya. While one thrills to the triumphs of conviction which permitted faithful Christian martyrs to tread Satan under their feet, at times one has a hard time following a narrative that has become disjointed in the process of condensation.

WILLIAM J. DANKER

MISSIONARY LIFE AND WORK. By Harold R. Cook. Chicago: Moody Press, 1959. 382 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

There has not yet been a satisfactory propaedeutic volume to supplant A. J. Brown's antiquated classic, *The Foreign Missionary*. More complete than Stanley Soltau's recent *Facing the Field*, this is a comprehensive attempt to fill the need. Cautious, middle-of-the-road advice to the missionary candidate

characterizes Cook's approach. Not selfish independence but humble interdependence in the body of Christ is the ideal toward which Cook feels the missionary should be leading the mission churches he plants and serves.

After a lifetime spent first as a missionary and then as a professor of missions at Moody Bible Institute Cook has written a very practical book. Although to many a seasoned missionary it may seem to abound in commonplaces, even the veteran will review it with profit. The excellent bibliography indicates that Cook is no stranger to the broader stream of ecumenical missiology.

WILLIAM J. DANKER

THIS IS AFRICA SOUTH OF THE SAHARA. By Newell S. Booth. New York: Friendship Press, 1959. 40 pages. Paper. 75 cents.

FUN AND FESTIVAL FROM AFRICA. By Rose H. Wright. New York: Friendship Press, 1959. 48 pages. Paper. 60 cents.

CHRISTIAN MISSION DIGEST, 1959—60. New York: Friendship Press, 1959. 64 pages. Paper. Price not given.

INTRODUCING ANIMISM. By Eugene A. Nida and William A. Smalley. New York: Friendship Press, 1959. 64 pages. Paper. 90 cents.

These pamphlets, written from an ecumenical rather than a denominational point of view, will enrich the mission education program of any parish, especially in the current emphasis on African mission studies in both the National Council of Churches and The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

The *Christian Mission Digest*, formerly published as *Christian World Facts*, annually supplies the pastor or mission study leader with fresh illustrations of the Gospel outreach. (Once again, there is a reference to the Japan Lutheran Hour in this year's edition.)

Newell S. Booth, resident Methodist bishop in the Belgian Congo, manages to touch virtually all the significant concerns of Africa and the African Church in 40 pages that go beyond recital of fact to elicit sympathetic understanding.

Fun and Festival from Africa will be a mission program chairman's delight.

Introducing Animism continues the series of brief introductions to the non-Christian religions published by Friendship Press, literary arm of the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of Churches. Missionaries will also read it with much profit.

WILLIAM J. DANKER

YOGA. By Ernest Wood. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959. 271 pages. Paper. 95 cents.

It is difficult to achieve any substantial understanding of Hinduism without an appreciation of the fundamental role of yoga. Ernest Wood, a British educator who spent a lifetime in India, has prepared a very useful treatise on the religious, philosophical, psychological, and physical aspects that combine in this way to complete self-mastery and union with the divine. Chapter 13, based on the famed *Yoga Sutras* of the great Patanjali, is of special interest, although virtually the entire classical literature is covered.

Wood shows a long familiarity with practitioners of yoga. His references to modern psychology add meaning to his discussion of an abstruse subject that is fascinating a growing number of Westerners.

WILLIAM J. DANKER

I AM LUCIFER. By Clyde B. Clason. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. 288 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

An outline of history as told by the prince of this world instead of H. G. Wells—the idea is intriguing. The execution is bizarre, breezy, banal, and often in bad taste.

When the pope threatens excommunication the author cannot resist punning, "Arise, Lord, and judge Thy course," bellowed a papal bull." This is a fair sample. The description of David's encounter with Bathsheba is downright vulgar. The reviewer throws up his hands in the face of all the crudities he encounters.

Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Mazdaism—all are regarded as being of the same stuff as, if not on a plane with, Christianity. Lucifer looks upon each as his virtually equal enemy.

In fine, this ambitious attempt to write the history of the world as C. S. Lewis might have Screwtape tell it does not come off. The writer who manages the trick someday will have to walk the razor's edge. The present work lacks both the balance and the delicate tread. WILLIAM J. DANKER

FULFILL THY MINISTRY. By Herbert Berner. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 1959. 46 pages. Paper. 75 cents.

The lecturer on the Wenchel Foundation at Concordia Seminary in 1959 is a metropolitan pastor with a background of wide experience as a parish administrator and leader of laymen and pastors alike. In the two lectures of this volume Berner describes the process underlying his preparation of the parish sermon. But he proceeds to discuss in detail also the preacher himself, his qualifications and the spiritual nurture essential for them. A chapel talk supplements the two formal lectures. The style is candid and direct, and the materials are characterized by a combination of energy, concern for people, and Christian sincerity which should transmit itself to every reader.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

CULTURE AND THE CROSS. By G. Hall Todd. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. 111 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

The title is the theme of the opening sermon on John 12:20, 21, prompted by the

word "Greeks." The next eight sermons deal with Jesus' passion; the tenth is based on the appearance of Christ to Mary. The author appears to be faithful to the Gospel as the preaching of the atonement through the cross. His own preaching method comes short of his purpose through overelaborate rhetoric, prodigal and not always apt illustration and literary reference, and failure to make the purpose of the given sermon clear except at the very conclusion. The culture thus obscures the cross.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

ILLUSIONS AND DELUSIONS OF THE SUPERNATURAL AND THE OCCULT. By D. H. Rawcliffe. New York: Dover Publications, 1959. 551 pages. Paper. \$2.00.

Rawcliffe's work first came out in the early '50s under the title *The Psychology of the Occult*; the present reissue is unchanged except for the title. The original title was, in this reviewer's opinion, a better one. Though uncompromisingly materialistic in his approach—St. Paul's visions were "visual and auditory hallucinations" (p. 37), and his conversion was a "hysterical crisis" (pp. 241–242)—Rawcliffe's concern is less with the theologically "supernatural" than with "occult" phenomena. Auras and automatic writing, multiple personalities and mental healing, parapsychology and precognitive telepathy, water-divining and werewolves, all come in for at least a once-over lightly treatment, with the author stubbornly insisting upon a "rational" approach throughout.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

THROUGH THE YEAR WITH CHRIST. By Edwin C. Munson. Rock Island: Augustana Press, 1959. 389 pages. \$3.75.

This volume covers the third series of Gospel selections according to the Swedish lectionary. The sermons are brisk, show pastoral skill coupled with the effort to be

contemporary and literate, and seek to exalt Christ as Savior and Lord. Occasionally the printed material is almost too concise and probably received amplification in the delivery. These sermons indicate that the guidance of a pericopic system does not necessarily hamper the preacher's variety of treatment or concern for his people.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

WITCHCRAFT. By Charles Williams. New York: Meridian Books, 1959. 316 pages. Paper. \$1.45.

Witchcraft first came out in 1941, four years before the death of its author, and the situation of World War II is reflected on its pages. Williams was both a brilliant Christian novelist and a competent scholar; his supernatural novels bear witness to his mastery of the primary literature of witchcraft. Although it is no fare for queasy stomachs, here is a sensitively written "brief account of the history in Christian times"—from St. Anthony of Egypt to the Salem witch trials—"of that perverted way of the soul which we call magic or (on a lower level) witchcraft, and with the reaction against it" (p. 9). Everyone who teaches the Small Catechism must willy-nilly say something about witchcraft; since witchcraft is outside the direct experience of most of us, we ought to have at least some good second-hand knowledge of the subject. Granting that Williams' theology is sometimes not our own, the present work is in this reviewer's opinion the best one currently available for acquiring the needed information.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

SERMONS ON SIMON PETER. By Clovis G. Chappell. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959. 128 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

"Is he still at it?" many an old-timer at preaching will say, not disrespectfully, when he sees the announcement of another Chappell book. There have been 23 before! This

is good Chappell. The enjoyment in telling a story, the practical applications sometimes only hinted at, the parallel illustration from current life, and a good overarching focus on a central thrust for the day, these are all here. "Angles" and basic English craftsmanship are especially good. Here are 12 sermons about Peter, on texts from the gospels, the Acts, and the First Epistle. They read well in one sitting. Thus pulled together, the splendid Gospel affirmation (p. 64, "Simon Peter on Calvary") is ample. As a man would preach one of these at a time, he would have to make it pervade the rest more explicitly; and preach it as a power for believing more insistently than the "willing to obey" (p. 16) and "if we have faith to receive" (p. 67) language permits.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

THE MYSTERY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER: SERMONS ON THE SACRAMENT PREACHED IN THE KIRK OF EDINBURGH BY ROBERT BRUCE IN A.D. 1589. Translated and edited by Thomas F. Torrance. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958. 198 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

Robert Bruce of Kinnaird (d. in 1631) bears the name of the conqueror of Edward II at Bannockburn (d. in 1329). The theologian belongs to the company of John and Andrew Melville, a second generation champion of Scottish Presbyterianism. He gave to the Kirk, says Torrance, stability and leadership; "his teaching is forever embedded in the heart of the Kirk he loved and did so much to reform and raise up to the glory of God" (p. 27). His sermons contain sustained reasoning, but his dialectics are not sufficiently fortified with Scripture. He refutes the papists and scorns those who teach ubiquity. He is a receptionist in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. "Indeed, so truly is the Body of Christ conjoined with the bread, and the Blood of Christ conjoined

with the b
ful n
of C
And
mout
your
he s
Lord
he do
these
say,
serm
near

HOW
N
pa
H
can
bring
said,
learn

D
throu
half-
leash
revie
and
learni
ity f
intel
play
tivat

If
conce
phas
insig
theor
chos
and
lear
deta
cati
self
pen

elling sometimes from focus are all sman- 2 ser- gospels, read er, the Simon man e, he more r be- ing to h to

ER

SUP-
CRA-
K OF
E IN
l by
Va.:
loth.

631)
Ed-
The
John
ation
He
and
dded
did
lory
sus-
not
re-
ach
doc-
ruly
the
ned

with the wine, that as soon as you receive the bread in your mouth (if you are a faithful man or woman) you receive the Body of Christ in your soul, and that by faith. And as soon as you receive the wine in your mouth, you receive the Blood of Christ in your soul, and that by faith" (p. 44). When he speaks about the preparation for the Lord's Supper, which he does in two sermons, he does not emphasize that he who believes these words, as Luther said, has what they say, namely, the forgiveness of sins. These sermons are Calvinistic; as such they are near classics.

CARL S. MEYER

HOW ADULTS LEARN. By J. R. Kidd. New York: Association Press, 1959. 324 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

Here is a man who is convinced that adults can learn, and he has taken the trouble to bring together what is known, what has been said, and what is being found out about adult learning.

Dealing first with the concept of learning through life, Kidd refutes many myths and half-truths which aborted past efforts to unleash the potential of the adult mind. He reviews what we know about the adult learner and examines the factors that influence adult learning capacity: his personality and capacity for growth; physical and sensory changes; intelligence and changes in capacity; the part played by emotions, attitudes, interests, motivations.

In succeeding sections the author describes concrete teacher-learner techniques and emphasizes a variety of ways to apply these insights in practice. From a capsule-view of theories of learning some formulations are chosen to help understand the adult learner and learning. In dealing with the teaching-learning transaction, the author sets out in detail and with ample illustrations an application of what has been learned about the self and learning. Here he shows what happens in the adult learning transaction.

For the person who wants a few quick and easy gimmicks this book will be hard going and quite useless. By the serious student who really wants to know something about adult learning, this book will be appreciated very much.

HARRY G. COINER

THE HEAVENS DECLARE. By Maurice Thaddeus Brackbill. Chicago: Moody Press, 1959. 128 pages. \$2.75.

A retired teacher in a Mennonite college, trained as an astronomer, assembles some interesting data about the stars and the earth, calculated to enlarge the reader's reverence for God and to indicate the contributions of nuclear physics to this reverence.¹ His conclusion that "matter and energy . . . must be two manifestations of one and the same thing . . . physical energy and spiritual energy must be two forms of one and the same fundamental entity" (p. 107) seems to be pantheism however much the author disclaims it, particularly since he makes man's created constitution and hence kinship with God the basis of man's faith (p. 122).

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

SOLDIERS OF THE WORD: THE STORY OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY. By John M. Gibson. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. v + 304 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

The American Bible Society was organized in 1816 through the efforts of Samuel J. Mills, Elias Boudinot, and others. Between 1852 and 1922 it printed over 20 million Bibles, more than 35 million Testaments, and more than 21 million portions of Scriptures. In 1922 it turned over its plates to commercial firms. The work of the American Bible Society, however, is not completed yet. Some of its past accomplishments are told by Gibson, largely in anecdotal fashion. It is a story that deserves better telling although Gibson's telling retains the reader's interest.

CARL S. MEYER

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of a book in this list acknowledges its receipt and does not preclude further discussion of its contents in the Book Review section)

Protestantism and Capitalism — The Weber Thesis and Its Critics, ed. Robert W. Green. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1959. xii + 116 pages. Paper. Price not given.

Pirenne Thesis — Analysis, Criticism, and Revision, ed. Alfred F. Havighurst. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1958. xvi + 109 pages. Paper. Price not given.

The Coronation of Charlemagne: What Did It Signify? ed. Richard E. Sullivan. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1959. xvi + 99 pages. Paper. Price not given.

100 Basic Bible Questions Answered. By Nathan Stone. Westchester: Good News Publishers, no date. 64 pages. Paper. 50 cents.

The Flood. By Alfred M. Rehwinkel. Westchester: Good News Publishers, no date. 62 pages. Paper. 50 cents.

The Pastor at Work. By various authors. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. viii + 414 pages. Cloth. \$6.50.

Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews. By Victor Tcherikover; translated from the Hebrew by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959. vii + 566 pages. Cloth. \$6.

Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions and Death's Duel. By John Donne. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959. 240 pages. Paper. \$1.65.

John Wesley's Theology Today. By Colin W. Williams. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 252 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

Kirche und Heilsgeschichte bei Gerhard von Reichersberg. By Erich Meuthen. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959. viii + 181 pages. Paper. Guilders 21.—

Luther und der Papst. By Ernst Bizer. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958. 56 pages. Paper. DM 3.50.

Das Mosebild von Heinrich Ewald bis

Martin Noth. By Rudolf Smend. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. vii and 80 pages. Paper. DM 8.80.

Religion in the Making. By Alfred North Whitehead. New York: Meridian Books, 1960. 154 pages. Paper. \$1.25. A paperback reissue of the famed series of four lectures that Whitehead delivered in King's Chapel, Boston, in 1926 on "the type of justification which is available for belief in doctrines of religion."

Christian Perspectives 1960. By the Association for Reformed Scientific Studies in Canada. Pella, Iowa: Pella Publishing Co., 1960. 159 pages. Paper. \$1.50.

Geschichte der deutschen Lyrik: Von Luther bis zum Ausgang des zweiten Weltkrieges. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1960. Second edition. xvi + 906 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

Skandalon: Um das Wesen des Katholizismus. By Joseph Klein. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958. xii + 464 pages. Cloth. DM 29.—

The Song of Roland, trans. C. K. Scott Moncrieff. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959. x + 139 pages. Paper. \$1.65.

Student's Hebrew Lexicon: A Compendious and Complete Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, ed. Benjamin Davies. New edition, ed. Edward C. Mitchell. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, no date given. xlii + 752 pages. Cloth. \$5.95. An unaltered photolithographed reissue of the 1880 edition.

Christian Faith and the Liberal Arts, ed. Harold Ditmanson, Howard Hong, and Warren Quanbeck. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. vii + 280 pages. Cloth. \$4.95.

An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England. By Peter Hunter Blair. New York: Cam-

brid
page

L
ring
sity
Clot

L
Alfr
ciate
give

P
tran
tin's
\$6.
T

Per
ed
vers
\$7.
T

Re
me
Rob
190

I
ere
Boo
\$8.
T

W
tio
Yo
pa

or
All
Cle

By
ica

tol
Sk
ape
18

W

bridge University Press, 1959. xvi + 382 pages. Paper. \$2.95.

Labor in a Free Society, ed. Michael Harrington and Paul Jacobs. Berkeley: University of California, 1959. xi + 186 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Lenin on the Question of Nationality. By Alfred D. Low. New York: Bookman Associates, 1958. 193 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

Peter the Great. By Vasili Klyuchevsky; trans. Liliana Archibald. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959. xii + 282 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.

The Works of Jonathan Edwards, ed. Perry Miller. Vol. II: *Religious Affections*, ed. John E. Smith. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959. vii + 526 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

The Atonement and the Sacraments: The Relationship of the Atonement to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. By Robert S. Paul. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 396 pages. Cloth. \$6.50.

Baker's Dictionary of Theology, ed. Everett F. Harrison. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. 566 pages. Cloth. \$8.95.

The Catholic Church in the Modern World: A Survey from the French Revolution to the Present. By E. E. Y. Hales. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960. 314 pages. Paper. 95 cents.

A History of Modern Germany: The Reformation. By Hajo Holborn. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959. xvi + 374 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

Freud and Dewey on the Nature of Man. By Morton Levitt. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. 180 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

The Incarnation: A Study of the Christology of the Ecumenical Creeds. By Bjarne Skard; trans. Herman E. Jorgensen. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. 184 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

An Introduction to the History of the Western Tradition. By Edgar N. Johnson.

Boston: Ginn and Company, 1959. Vol. I, x + 821 pages; Vol. II, viii + 798 pages. Cloth. \$8.00 each.

Philosophy in the Middle Ages: An Introduction (Philosophie au moyen âge). By Paul Vignaux; trans. E. C. Hall. New York: Meridian Books, 1959. 223 pages. Paper. \$1.35.

Schöpfung und Erlösung: Dogmatik. By Regin Prenter. Vol. II: *Die Erlösung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960. 284 pages. Paper. DM 14.50.

Stewardship in Contemporary Theology, ed. T. K. Thompson. New York: Association Press, 1960. 252 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Stoics and Sceptics. By Edwyn Bevan. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1959. 152 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

The Dive That Changed My Life. By Wajih Aziz Sim'an. New York: Pageant Press, 1960. 139 pages. Cloth. \$2.75.

The Early Liturgy: To the Time of Gregory the Great. By Josef A. Jungmann; trans. Francis A. Brunner. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959. x + 314 pages. Cloth. \$5.75.

The English Carol. By Erik Routley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. 272 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

The Mass and the English Reformers. By C. W. Dugmore. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958. xiv + 262 pages. Cloth. 30/-.

Mystical Writings of Rulman Merswin, ed. Thomas S. Kepler. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960. 144 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

The Book of Exodus: Part I. By Roland E. Murphy. New York: Paulist Press, 1960. 96 pages. Paper. 75 cents.

Calvin, sein Weg und sein Werk. By Willem F. Dankbaar. Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1959.

The Capetian Kings of France: Monarchy and Nation (987—1328) (Les Capétians et la France). By Robert Fawtier; trans. Lionel Butler and R. J. Adam. New York: St. Mar-

tin's Press, 1960. x + 242 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

The Church in the Thought of Jesus. By Joseph B. Clower, Jr. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959. 160 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Creative Imagination in Preaching. By Webb B. Garrison. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 175 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Kulturgeschichte von Byzanz. By Hans-Wilhelm Haussig. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1959. xvi + 624 pages; 31 plates. Cloth. DM 15.—.

Life That Is Eternal. By J. F. Strombeck. Westchester, Ill.: Good News Publishers, no date. 64 pages. Paper. 50 cents.

The Middle Ages in Recent Historical Thought: Selected Topics. By Bryce Lyon. Washington, D.C.: Service Center for Teachers of History, 1959. 37 pages. Paper. Price not given.

L'Orthodoxie. By Paul Evdokimov. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959. 351 pages. Paper. Sw. Fr. 15.—.

The Proceedings of the Third Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, ed. Carl E. Lund-Quist. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1958. 210 pages; 16 plates. Paper. \$3.00.

The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921 to 1929. By Isaac Deutscher. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. xii + 490 pages. Cloth. \$9.50.

Buddhism: Its Essence and Development. By Edward Conze. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 212 pages. Paper. \$1.35.

The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods. By Frank E. Manuel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. xvi + 336 pages. Cloth. \$6.75.

The Oxford History of England: The Fourteenth Century, 1307—1399. By May McKisack. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. xix + 598 pages. Cloth. \$4.60.

Is the Bible Inspired? By John Burnaby. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1959. 120 pages. Paper. 4/6.

The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse.

By Massey Shepherd, Jr. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960. 99 pages. Paper. \$1.50.

Saint Ignatius Loyola: Letters to Women (Ignatius von Loyola, Briefwechsel mit Frauen). By Hugo Rahner; trans. Kathleen Pond and S. A. H. Weetman. New York: Herder and Herder, 1960. xxiii + 565 pages. Cloth. \$11.50.

Straight Tongue: A Story of Henry Benjamin Whipple, First Episcopal Bishop of Minnesota. By Philips Endecott Osgood. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison and Company, 1958. 288 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth (De Triomf der Gnade in de Theologie van Karl Barth). By G. C. Berkouwer; trans. by Harry R. Boer. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1956. 414 pages. Paper. \$4.95.

When the Bamboo Sings. Douglas C. Percy. Westchester: Good News Publishers, 1960. 63 pages. Paper. 50 cents.

Kierkegaard's Dialectic of Existence (Die Existenzialektik von Søren Kierkegaard). By Hermann Diem; trans. by Harold Knight. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959. viii + 217 pages. Cloth. 21/-.

Kirche und Theologische Literature im byzantinischen Reich. By Hans Georg Beck. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959. xvi + 835 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

Lebre und Wirklichkeit in der alten Weisheit: Studien zu den Sprüchen Salomos und zu dem Buche Hiob. By Harmut Gese. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958. vi + 90 pages. Paper. DM 9.—.

Lordship and Discipleship. By Eduard Schweizer. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1960. 136 pages. Paper. \$2.25.

Der "moderne Katholizismus" und seine Kritiker. By Karl Gerhard Steck. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958. 34 pages. Paper. DM 2.00.

Myth and Reality in the Old Testament. By Brevard S. Childs. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1960. 112 pages. Paper. \$2.00.

mond: John
paper. \$1.50.
Letters to Women
wechsel mit
Kathleen
New York:
xiii + 565

Henry Benja-
l Bishop of
cott Osgood,
and Company,
0.

Theology of
enade in de
G. C. Berk-
Grand Rap-
5. 414 pages.

Douglas C.
rs Publishers,
nts.

istence (Die
Kierkegaard).
Harold Knight.
1959. viii +

Literature im
Georg Beck.
agsbuchhand-
Cloth. Price

*er alten Weis-
Salomos und*
it Gese. Tü-
beck), 1958.

By Eduard
R. Allenson,
.

" und seine
ck. Munich:
pages. Paper.

d Testament.
ville: Alec R.
aper. \$2.00.